LATINITAS PERENNIS

VOLUME I

THE CONTINUITY OF LATIN LITERATURE

edited by

WIM VERBAAL, YANICK MAES

AND

JAN PAPY

BRILL

LATINITAS PERENNIS

VOLUME I

BRILL'S STUDIES
IN
INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

VOLUME 144

LATINITAS PERENNIS

Volume I

The Continuity of Latin Literature

EDITED BY

WIM VERBAAL
YANICK MAES
JAN PAPY

BRILL

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

INTRODUCTION

PART II

BEGINNINGS?

PART III

PERFECTIONS?

PREFACE

Together with Greek, Latin preserves the oldest extant literature of Western Europe. Having become very early in its history 'a language without a country', Latin survived as the only supra-national language which European history has ever known. For almost two thousand years, Latin remained the language for international diplomacy, for intellectual schooling and also for a literature which was not restricted to national preoccupations. There is no need to wonder, then, that most of the greatest names in the history of European literature have left more or less important Latin works. These eminent representatives are not limited, however, to the Latin masters of Roman Antiquity, the high Middle Ages or the Golden Age of Humanism. They also include writers better known for their literary works in the vernacular languages, such as Boccaccio, Goethe and Rimbaud.

Yet hitherto no comprehensive approach to Latin literature as a whole seems to have been attempted; its continuous history from its very start until today has not been studied as such. Latinists remain almost exclusively concentrated on one of the three great literary periods, often without serious interest in even the most important currents and contributors in the other fields. The result is a very segmentary approach, which might give the impression that there are at least three Latin literatures, each quite independent of the others.

In the last few years, however, initiatives have been taken towards a new and more comprehensive approach to Latin literature. The recent creation of a *Dottorato di Ricerca in Studi Umanistici: Antichità, Medioevo, Rinascimento* by the Istituto di Studi Umanistici of the Università degli Studi di Firenze is an impressive and important sign of a changing attitude. An integral approach to classical and medieval Latin literature appeared also in the conference at Oxford of 3–5 April 2003 on *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*. Even so these remain somewhat isolated and independent trials. The only thoroughly-studied linkage still seems to be the reception of the classical heritage by later centuries.

One of the reasons for this remarkable lack of interest, of course, has to be found in the huge field which is covered by Latin writing

and in which the boundaries of literature are not always very clear cut. In Antiquity and the Middle Ages even the most technical treatises adhered to the literary standards of rhetoric. In modern times, the transition towards a truly technical language has taken some centuries to complete. For a long time, Latin with its literary standards remained the vehicle of sciences and developed only gradually into a truly technical language, which no longer observed the literary rules of traditional rhetoric.

Besides the internal difficulties of separating the literary from the merely written within each Latin period, another problem is raised by the sheer quantity of material, which no individual can master by himself and which seems to impede an all-embracing approach to the literature as a whole. It follows that a focussed and intense collaboration between specialists from the different fields imposes itself. Even here problems arise because of the quantity of writings within the several periods. No Neo-Latinist can hope to master the whole of Latin literature from the fourteenth until far into the twentieth century, let alone a Medio-Latinist confronted by the ten centuries of medieval literature.

In spite of these difficulties, the time seems ripe for a first attempt to break down the traditional walls which separate the research of the different periods and to come to a first comprehensive survey of Latin literature as one and continuous, starting somewhere in the third century B.C. and continuing up to the present day. This book is not intended to fill the gap. Rather it hopes to take a first step in instigating further initiatives in the direction of a new and more comprehensive approach to Latin literature as a unique and continuous phenomenon within the totality of European literatures. Its contributions developed from papers given at the contactforum *Latinitas perennis I: The Continuity of Latin Literature*, which took place at the *Koninklijke Vlaamse Akademie van Wetenschappen en Kunsten van België* (Brussel), on 22 April 2005. Two more volumes are scheduled for 2008 and 2010 on the issues of *Appropriation by Latin Literature* (2008) and *The Property of Latin Literature* (2010).

NOTES ON THE EDITORS

Yanick MAES is Assistant in the department of Latin & Greek at Ghent University (Belgium)). In 2005 he completed his doctoral dissertation on Lucan. His (forthcoming) publications include articles on suicide in Vergil, Lucan, the role of *exercitatio* in Quintilian, the use of allusion, and the sociology of literature. He is currently working on a study of the figure of Cato as a cultural icon.

Jan PAPY is Research Professor of Neo-Latin at the Catholic University of Leuven. His research focuses mainly on Italian humanism (Petrarch, Pico della Mirandola), Humanism in the Low Countries (Vives, Erasmus, Lipsius), Intellectual History and Renaissance Philosophy in the Low Countries (16th–17th centuries). He is the author of numerous articles dealing with subjects related to these fields. Besides, he is the editor of *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae: Pars XIII (1600)*, Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten (Brussels 2000), and he has co-edited *Justus Lipsius, Europae lumen et columen. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven–Antwerp, 17–20 September 1997* (Leuven 1999), *Self-Presentation and Social Identification. The Rhetoric and Pragmatics of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times* (Leuven 2002) and with K. Enenkel, *Petrarch and His Readers in the Renaissance*, (Leiden–Köln 2005). He is member of the editorial board of *Humanistica Lovaniensia: Journal for Neo-Latin Studies*.

Wim VERBAAL is Professor in Latin Language and Literature at the Department of Latin and Greek of the University of Ghent. He published a book in Dutch on the conflict between Bernard of Clairvaux and Abelard, prepares another on Bernard's writing techniques and published several articles on different aspects of Bernard's works and their reception, e.g. in the Modern Devotion by Gerard Zerbolt of Zutphen. Besides, articles are published on Latin poetry: the *Hortulus* of Walahfrid Strabo, Rutilius Namatianus' *De reditu suo* and on Juvencus, but his main field of research remains Latin literature of the Twelfth Century. He is member of the editorial boards of *Sacris Erudiri. Journal on the Inheritance of Early and Medieval Christianity*, of *Millennium. Tijdschrift voor Middeleeuwse Studies* and of *Hermeneus: Tijdschrift voor Antieke Cultuur*.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Davide Canfora is associated Professor of Italian Philology at the University of Bari. He published on subjects in the early Italian Renaissance, recently concentrating himself on political and cultural backgrounds, see, recently, *Prima di Machiavelli. Politica e cultura in età umanistica* (Roma–Bari 2005) and "Culture and Power in Naples from 1450 to 1650", in M. Gosman – A. Macdonald – A. Vanderjagt (eds.), *Princes and Princely Culture 1450–1650*, 2 vols. (Leiden–Boston 2005) 2:79–96.

Perrine Galand-Hallyn is Professor at the École pratique des Hautes Études, at the Sorbonne (Paris) and responsable for the chair of Neo-Latin. She published on various aspects of Italian and Northern Renaissance literature, see, recently, with F. Hallyn, Professor at the University of Ghent, *Poétiques de la Renaissance. Le modèle italien, le monde franco-bourguignon et leur héritage en France au XVIe siècle*, Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance 348 (Genève 2001).

Sander M. Goldberg is Professor of Classics at the University of California, Los Angeles. His research concentrates on the idea of the literary in the Roman Republic. Besides he studies the relationship between classical rhetorical theory and eighteenth-century music. He is the author of *The Making of Menander's Comedy* (Berkeley 1980), *Understanding Terence* (Princeton 1986), *Epic in Republican Rome* (Oxford 1995) and has recently attributed to *A Companion to Ancient Epic* (London 2005).

Thomas Haye is Professor of Medieval and Neo-Latin Philology at the University of Göttingen. He is the author of *Das lateinische Lehrgedicht im Mittelalter. Analyse einer Gattung*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 22 (Köln–Leiden 1997); *Oratio. Mittelalterliche Redekunst in lateinischer Sprache*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 27 (Köln–Leiden 1999) *Lateinische Oralität. Gelehrte Sprache in der mündlichen Kommunikation des hohen und späten Mittelalters* (Berlin–New York 2005).

Michael Roberts is Robert Rich Professor of Latin at the Wesleyan University. He is the author of *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late*

Antiquity, ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 16 (Liverpool 1985); *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1989); *Poetry and the Cult of the Martyrs: The Liber Peristephanon of Prudentius* (Ann Arbor 1993).

Francesco Stella is Professor of Latin Literature of the Middle Ages and the Humanism at the University of Siena-Arezzo. He has published on subjects of Late Antiquity and early Middle Ages, see, e.g., *Poesia dell'alto medioevo europeo: manoscritti, lingua e musica dei ritmi latini* (Firenze 2001); in collaboration with E. D'Angelo, *Poetry of the early medieval Europe: manuscripts, language and music of the Latin rhythmical texts* (Firenze 2003).

Marc Van der Poel is Professor of Latin Language and Literature at the Radboud University Nijmegen (NL). He published on various topics concerning the Northern humanism, see, e.g., "Cardano's *Neronis encomium*: literary trifle or political treatise?", *Studi umanistici Piceni* 25 (2005) 283–291; "For freedom of opinion: Erasmus's defense of the *Encomium matrimonii*", *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 25 (2005) 1–17; "Rhetorik. B. Geschichte. I. Quellengeschichte (wichtigste Autoren nach Epochen: bio-bibliographisch). 3. Frühe Neuzeit (15.–17. Jh.)", in G. Ueding (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, vol. 7 (Tübingen 2005) 1460–1468.

Gregor Vogt-Spira is Professor of Classical Philology and Latin at the University of Greifswald. In his research, he concentrates on the tension between orality and litteracy with special attention to the Early Modern Period, see, recently, in collaboration with L. Deitz, *Julius Caesar Scaliger: Poetices libri septem. Sieben Bücher über die Dichtkunst*, 5 vols. (Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt 1994–2003); "Emotionalität 'in performance': Römische Rhetorik zwischen Macht der Worte und Macht der Bilder", in D. Bormann – F. Wittchow (eds.), *Emotionalität in der Antike* (Berlin 2005) 246–264.

Jan Ziolkowski is Arthur Kingsley Porter Professor of Medieval Latin at Harvard University. He has published many articles and books on various topics, mostly concerning the twelfth century, see, e.g., *Talking animals: medieval Latin beast poetry, 750–1150* (Philadelphia, Pa. 1993); *Alan of Lille's Grammar of Sex: The Meaning of Grammar to a Twelfth Century Intellectual*, Speculum Anniversary Monographs 10 (Cambridge, Mass. 1985).

PART I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER ONE

THE BURDEN OF THE PAST:
BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION

WIM VERBAAL

The Past can be a burden. It may be painful to look back. One need only look back, as modern man, on the threshold of a new century, and indeed of a new millennium, to see this all too well. As the heirs of the twentieth century, it implies that we have to confront some of the darkest pages of human history. Future generations might well consider our times to have been darkened in the shadow of this near and sometimes dreadful Past.

The Past can also become a burden by hindering us in our movements, by limiting our freedom of action and even our freedom to think. We all feel ourselves somehow predetermined by the obligations of our Past, by our responsibility for it or by our commitment to meet its expectations.

For both reasons, any generation will know the desire to break away from its own Past, to evoke a kind of breaking-point, a breach in the continuity of History—however impossible this might seem—with a view to creating something quite new. The second half of the last century can be characterized in the West by this desire to leave behind its Past and to start once again, make a brand-new beginning. The future will show to what extent this attempt did or did not fail.

One of the points of departure for this book has to be found in the 'burden' of the modern Latinist's scholarly Past. Contemporary research into Latin literature is still overshadowed by its heritage, by the influence of nineteenth-century philology, notably of the 'Philologie des 19. Jahrhunderts', the German philology (itself, needless to say, the child of the classicism that invaded Europe before 1800).[1] Some examples may illustrate this.

---

[1] I refer to the attitude of the French scholar Désiré Nisard, as illustrated in the

One of the effects of nineteenth-century philology—and perhaps its most drastic one—has been the fact that Latin lost the prominence which it had enjoyed until about 1800. Its role of international, or rather supra-national, language had already been questioned during the eightteenth century. It was slowly supplanted by French.

It next lost its primacy as a classical language to Greek. As a result, the Latin literature of Antiquity came to be considered as secondary, as a derivative of Greek literature. This had far-reaching results.

First of all, the study of classical Latin literature came to be, for more than a century, subordinate to the study of its Greek sources. This remains one of the most characteristic elements of the commentaries on classical texts.[2]

Secondly, the supposed total dependency of classical Latin literature on the Greeks led many an eminent scholar to attempt the reconstruction, from the Latin text, of the presumed but lost Greek sources. We might adduce for example the reconstructions of Menander's comedies by means of Plautus or Terence. How dangerous such an attempt is, becomes immediately clear when we imagine some earnest reconstruction of Euripides' *Hippolytos* on the basis of the *Phèdre* of Racine. While no one would deny the danger or even the impossibility of this last experiment, few such warnings are heard against a similar attitude towards Latin literature.

In the end, this degradation of Latin literature by nineteenth-century philologists to a kind of second-hand Greek literature has burdened the scholarly field for decades, giving rise to an almost universal assumption that classical Latin literature has no originality at all and few characteristics of its own. And because the Classics of Latin Antiquity were the models for the later Latinities, it must follow that these are even worse!

---

article of P. Galand-Hallyn, "Descriptions décadentes. L' 'inquiet plaisir' de Désiré Nisard", *Poétique* 99 (1994) 321–337.

[2] Just one illuminating example can be found in the approach of Roman satire by Karl Kerényi, one of those greater heirs of the nineteenth-century philologists, in his "Satire und Satura (Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund einer literarischen Gattung)", first published in *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 9 (1933) 129–156, reprinted in B. Fabian (ed.), *Satura. Ein Kompendium moderner Studien zur Satire* (Hildesheim–New York 1975) 38–65, in which the Roman ethymology of the word *satura* from the *lanx satura*—as it is now generally more or less accepted—is considered to be 'unacceptable' ('unannehmbar') because of its negative connotation, anyway, in the eyes of this scholar. For this reason he looks rather after a more noble (read: Greek) birth of Roman satire.

Our second heritage of nineteenth-century philology is the rather rigid determination of what can be called a 'Classic'. Limiting ourselves now to Latin, it may be clear that the honourary title of 'Classic' was initially reserved for the writers of the 'Golden' Augustan period. Later its significance was widened somewhat to include some writers of the 'Silver' Latinity, but as the metallic label already denotes, qualification as true 'Classics' could only belong to Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, Livy and a few others.

This assumption restricts the sense of 'classicism' of course to an all but absolute minimum. This to be sure would have caused no problem, if 'classic' had not also become a sort of normative qualification, against which all literary expressions in Latin came to be judged. And every work which did not correspond to this norm had thus to be classified as 'immature', 'baroque', 'deviant', 'barbarous', 'decadent' and so on.

One of the immediate results has been the tendency of editors to correct. By which, of course, we mean 'to conjecture'. Whenever an editor encountered an 'un-classical' word or expression, he was tempted to replace it by a more 'classical' term. And if happily he managed to resist this temptation, he all too often glossed it as a 'barbarism'. The results of such judgements become immediately clear when editing Latin literature of, let us say, the Merovingian period.

But such 'classic rigorism' could have more extreme consequences. Sometimes it attacked the models of classicism itself. A nice example is offered by the 1915 Teubner edition of Vergil's *Bucolica* and *Georgica* by Otto Ribbeck. Ribbeck did not hesitate to reorganize entire passages from these works (notably in the *Georgica*) to make them conform to a more 'classical' line of thought, at least according to his interpretation.

How influential this classicist approach to texts has been and still is, will be clear to all who are studying texts which do not in any way meet these rigid norms at all. Recently, for example, I had occasion to review a paper in which Abelard's celebrated autobiography, the *Historia calamitatum*, had been reorganized root and branch. The reasoning behind this reconstruction was that a man with such a logical and classical mind could not have written so inconsistent a story.

Another result of classicist attitudes could be the lack of interest in, and understanding of, the poetry of the final centuries of the first millennium. Here I do not refer to the classical Carolingian poems, but rather to the *sequentiae*, the *tractus* and the Ottonian *modus*, all presumably based on a more melodious poetics.

Before we move on, however, it might be as well to emphasize that these
remarks are not intended to denigrate the philologists of the nineteenth
century. On the contrary, I am convinced that their approach to Latin
literature arose naturally from their mastering of the language and the
classical literature to a degree, which many latinists today might well
envy. It is precisely because of their scientific clout that the heritage
they left has proved hard to carry and even harder to break with.

The establishment and recognition of a classicist norm, and the con-
sequent blindness for all aspects of Latin which do not conform to it,
have had another far-reaching consequence. This is the impossibility of
accepting the rather obvious fact (obvious that is to everyone outside
the field of Latin) that a language always covers a large expressive spec-
trum, creating the possibility of diverse and strongly diverging literary
styles or registers. Latin too is a language; and it ought to be self-evident
that it has known a similar range of expressions. To remain blind to this
is to risk needless problems.

One of these can be seen in the problematics of dating works or
writers. A text is often situated along the chronological line of Latin
literature according to its degree of conformity to the classical standard.
An example might be the treatise *On Astronomy*, ascribed to Hyginus,
which in most dictionaries is still dated to the beginning of the second
century of the Christian Era. This dating is solely based, as has been
demonstrated by the most recent editor, on its stylistic and lexical 'un-
classicity'.[3] Denying the validity of this criterion, the editor has returned
the work to Augustus' physician, thus confirming this particular 'un-
classicity' to be the immediate contemporary of the great classical
models.

Another example of the resultant problematics can be found in the
many 'discoveries' of anonymous poems in the first centuries of modern
times, often attributed, because of their conformity to the classical
norm, to (known or unknown) poets of Antiquity. More recent research,
however (notably by the great philologists of the nineteenth century),
was able to ascribe them to poets of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.
Hildebert of Lavardin has been recognized as one of these 'medieval
poets of Antiquity'![4]

---

[3] Hyginus, *L'astronomie*, ed. A. le Bœuffle (Paris 1983) xxxi–xxxviii.
[4] On the poems by Hildebert which were included in the *Anthologia palatina* and

Such erroneous attributions are not exclusive to a less scientific past. The commentary on the Book of Kings, which had been attributed for centuries to Gregory the Great and has been published under his name in modern times, was recently ascribed to an unknown writer of around 1100.

Another consequence of classicist rigidity is the everlasting discussion on the authenticity of certain works. It simply seems impossible to recognize that one writer may have been versed in different styles and registers. The best-known example is Gregory the Great, whose paternity of the *Dialogues* is still a hotly debated subject.

A final consequence of classicist normativity (and to every medio-latinist the most disastrous) has been the almost unconscious and automatic connection set up between the classical models of Antiquity and their 'classicist' imitators and followers among the early humanists. Thus we can find in almost every book with a diachronic survey (be it from a philosophical, literary, scientific, rhetorical or any other perspective) the almost unquestioned leap from the age *zero* to the neo-latin literature of the early humanists, leaving the intermediate period of over a thousand years to one side as a period of stagnation, barbarism and decadence which need not be taken into consideration.

So much for the burden of our latinist Past. Let us now turn for a moment to Latin itself, because the question must be asked as to whether there are no indications in Latin literature itself which have given rise to these later philological normativities and periodizations. To which all latinists will surely reply that there are.

Often enough, the burden of the Past was also felt by the Latin writers themselves. Frequently they wanted to break away from it and be free in their own movements and choices. Did not Ennius already boast that he had far outdistanced his rude predecessors? This opinion was duly confirmed by those who came after him, although they, for their part, distanced themselves from Ennius, considering their own period as the culmination of Latin letters. And on this point all classicist movements of later periods have agreed.

Did not the Christian writers of the fifth and sixth centuries, in a certain sense, try to make a new beginning, to create a new literature, liberated from the burden of their pagan past? Nowhere perhaps does

---

attributed to Martial or Ovid, see *Hildebertus Carmina minora*, ed. A.B. Scott (Leipzig 1969).

this desire find a more important breaking point than in the writings of Gregory the Great and his contemporary and namesake Gregory of Tours.

And did not, in their turn, the Carolingian writers manifest the desire to break away from their 'barbarous' Merovingian predecessors by restoring a Latin of classical purity, based on the classical models, Vergil for poetry and Augustine for prose?

Do we not see a current of the same kind in the fourteenth century with the first humanists turning away from *their* 'barbarous' contemporaries, whom they reproach for writing a wholly decayed Latin? And, finally, is not a similar thing happening after 1800 with the institution of the modern school programmes for Latin?

The history of Latin literature thus seems to resemble an uninterrupted chain of breaking points, forever at pains to deny its own chronological continuity. The difference with literatures in other languages consists of the fact that, for Latin, the breaking point usually represents an attempt to revive a distant literary past.

Yet at the same time, those same breaking points are mostly the work of men who were themselves deeply versed in the Latin and the literature of their contemporaries and immediate predecessors.

This history of breaks and breaches brings to mind another aspect of the nineteenth-century philology, to wit the idea of an organic development of each literature, going through the phases of birth, infancy, adolescence, maturity, old age, decay and death. In truth, this historical model is as old as Latin literature itself. Apparently it was introduced into our Western thinking by Cicero in his *Brutus*. When we read this history of Roman rhetoric (which is, in a certain sense paradoxically, also the first literary history), it is clear that Cicero sees its development as an organic movement, describing its birth, infancy and adolescence to reach solid maturity in Cicero's own time (and person, of course). This structure, however, implies also that whatever might follow will inevitably lead to old age, decay, decadence and death.

The image of an organic development has long been an integral part of Western thinking. Nonetheless, it clashes internally with several other interpretations of history, in the first place with the likewise classical view of history as a progressive decay from an initial state of virtue and purity, a golden age. This view, to a certain degree, has been strengthened by the Christian interpretation of history, which sees its

culminating point in the birth and life of Christ and considers the subsequent eras as a progressive alienation.

Yet Christianity in the same breath acknowledges a steady climb towards the eternal fulfilment of Christian beatitude. In a translated sense, this idea of positive progress has, thanks to science, become determinative for the modern Western mind.

All these different, often mutually opposing, interpretations of the past, of the writer's own time and of its historical antecedents, have left their stamp on the contemporary philological approach to the history of Latin literature.

It has been pointed out, for example, how strongly marked our language frequently remains by a supposed organic development. Indeed, even in the various contributions to this book, it becomes clear that the assumption of 'Golden' or 'Silver' literary eras is alive and well in each of the specific fields of Latinism.

As a reaction against the organic view of literary history, other interpretations have arisen which do not question but rather reinforce the underlying assumptions. This may be illustrated by the illuminating divisions of medio-latin literature. According to many philologists during the twentieth century, medio-latin literature reached its culmination in the twelfth century. As such, this period has been labelled (in the best classicist manner of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries) as a 'renaissance', i.e. a revival of interest in and imitation of the classical models.

Now, in recent decades, criticism of the implicit idea of a growth of medio-latin literature towards this apogee of the twelfth century, has found its expression in the acknowledgment of other 'peaks', which are accordingly labelled as classic 'renaissances': the Carolingian renaissance, the Ottonian renaissance, the Anglo-Saxon renaissance now range alongside the renaissance of the twelfth century, not to mention the Aristotelian renaissance or the Italian renaissance. The list may well be incomplete. To each century, indeed to each country its own renaissance, or rather its renaissances, might be the conclusion. We are left to wonder what might have happened in between or around these multiple renaissances!

When, finally, taking all these elements into account—those breaking points, these continuous efforts to restore Latin literature in its classical purity, this desire to match all Latin literary expressions against the

models of Augustan literature—, modern Latinists cannot avoid coming up against the question: of what does Latin literature consist? What causes us to speak of a single literature in a language which has survived its native speakers for almost one and a half millennia? Surely we lack the most fundamental element which creates a literature *in se*, i.e. a language bound to a nation, to a people, to a group of persons bound by other bonds than solely the use of a language? Briefly, what gives Latin literature its defining character?

These are the kind of questions on which this book hopes to offer a first reflection. It will concentrate on the idea of continuity within this strange phenomenon which is the history of Latin literature. How might we approach its peculiar history, which consists of an almost uninterrupted continuity by way of breaking points, breaches and revivals? Is it possible to deduce any recognizable continuous strains, certain recurrent elements perhaps, which prevent Latin literature from falling apart into distinct literatures which would have nothing in common but their language—which in itself seems a contradiction in terms?

As the point of departure for tackling this question of continuity, the choice was made to take the most traditional philological periodization possible of Classical, Medieval and Neo-Latin Literature, out of the conviction that, in order to break away, for our part, from some aspects of our own philological past, we need firstly to demonstrate the limits of this periodization. And this could not be done in a more convincing way than by starting from it, hoping that the scheme itself will prove to be untenable.

For a similar reason, the contributions themselves have not been kept together within each traditional historical period, but are organized on the organic principle. The first part of the book is thus dedicated to the initial phase of each literary period, seen as the birth and infancy of Classical, Medieval and Neo-Latin literature. In Sander Goldberg's approach, the difference and even opposition between the concepts of 'archaism' and 'archaic' will be central to his examination of the reception of the early Latin writers by their heirs of the late Republic. Francesco Stella, concentrating on the biblical poetry of late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, takes as his point of departure the intercultural dialogue between the Greco-Roman literary inheritance and the recent creation of a biblico-Semitical arch-text. Davide Canfora demonstrates how Poggio Bracciolini in his *Facetiae* aims at a revival of Latin as a spoken language in all its vivid diver-

sity. In spite of this apparent disparateness, the reader will discover in each chapter parallel aims in the reconquest of the language, characterized in each period by an undeniable pride in its own achievements.

The second part treats the so-called Golden Ages and each of the three chapters deals with the concept of 'classicism' and 'classical'. Gregor Vogt-Spira explores in depth the motives and incentives underlying the creation and reception of a classical canon in Roman literature. Jan Ziolkowski takes a closer look at the part played by the masters of the twelfth century in recovering and creating, or recreating, the new 'classics', with special attention to the relationship with the *auctores* and the authority of the established canon. In Marc van der Poel's contribution, the tension between 'classicism' and 'modernism' is approached from the perspective of Renaissance rhetoric. Once again, some remarkable parallellisms come to the surface, in the first place the importance of the schools and of learning in the recognition and spread of a classical canon and normativity.

Finally, the periods of supposed decay and decadence come under discussion. Michael Roberts convincingly demonstrates how poets of late Antiquity succeeded in preserving their normative Greco-Roman literary inheritance while adapting it to a wholly new context. Thomas Haye deals with the peculiar situation and character of late medieval literature, perhaps the least known and least regarded in the entire history of Latin literature, marooned between the two 'renaissances' of the twelfth century and the Italian humanists. Finally, Perrine Galand-Hallyn closes the book with an illuminating essay on humanist attitudes towards the history of Latin literature, showing how, from its beginnings in modern times, the historiography of Latin has been submitted to normative classicism and its standards. More strongly than in other periods, a common tension seems to have persisted between the duties of transmission and metamorphosis, between the pride of being heir to a respectable tradition and the duty to give this a new and appropriate translation for contemporary needs.

Precisely because the parallellisms detected will not suffice to convince latinists of the existence of repeating patterns in history, it will be clear that all rigid periodization and schematization can only fail in the face of the diversity of historical reality. What will become clear from these papers, if nothing else, is the necessity of seeing the history of Latin literature as a continuum.

The editors hope that, by reading these contributions by specialists in each of the traditional fields, latinists will obtain a more nuanced and above all deepened insight into the extraordinary phenomenon of this literature which has survived its language as a native tongue, which has survived its people and nation, and which continues, in fact, to the present day. As such Latin literature constitutes a true expression of the Pan-Western European memory. A better understanding of its intrinsic mechanisms might provide us with a solid base to give our research and identity as heirs of this long tradition a new direction and thus, by breaking away in our turn from our philological Past, to assure its continuity.

Bibliography

This bibiliography is not meant to be exhaustive but rather to give some of the classical or most recent literature on the history of Latin literature in the three scholarly fields.

Albrecht M. von, *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, 2 vols. (Munich–New Providence–London–Paris 1994)

Brunhölzl F., *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. 1–2 (Munich 1975–1992)

Cavallo G. – Leonardi C. –Menestò E. (eds.), *Lo Spazio Letterario del Medioevo*, 5 vols. (Rome 1992–1998)

Conte G.B., *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. J.B. Solodow (London 1987)

Fantham E. *Roman literary culture: from Cicero to Apuleius* (Baltimore, Md. 1999)

——, "Imitation and Evolution: The Discussion of Rhetorical Imitation in Cicero *De Oratore* 2. 87–97 and Some Related Problems of Ciceronian Theory", *Classical Philology* 73 (1978) 1–16

——, "Imitation and Decline: Rhetorical Theory and Practice in the First Century after Christ", *Classical Philology* 73 (1978) 102–116

Golden M. – Toohey M. (eds.), *Inventing ancient culture* (London 1997)

Heldmann K., "Dekadenz und literarischer Fortschritt bei Quintilian und bei Tacitus", *Poetica* 12 (1980) 1–23

——, *Antike Theorien über Entwicklung und Verfall der Redekunst* (Munich 1982)

Herzog R. (ed.), *Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*, Handbuch der Lateinischen Literatur der Antike VIII. 5 (Munich 1989)

Hinds S., *Allusion and intertext* (Cambridge 1998)

IJsewijn J., *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies: History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature*, Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia 5 (Leuven 1990)

IJsewijn J. –Sacré D., *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Part Two: Literary, Linguistic,*

Philological and Editorial Questions, Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia 14 (Leuven 1998)

LEONARDI C. (ed.), *Letteratura latina medievale (secoli VI–XV)* (Firenze 2002)

MINNIS A. – JOHNSON I. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism 2. The Middle Ages* (Cambridge 2005)

MORTON BRAUND, S., *Latin Literature* (London–New York 2002)

SALLMANN, K. (ed.), *Die Literatur des Umbruchs. Von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur 117–284 n.Chr.*, Handbuch der Lateinischen Literatur der Antike 8. 4 (Munich 1997)

SCHMIDT E.A. (ed.), *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine. Huit exposés suivis de discussions. Entretiens préparés et présidés par Ernst August Schmidt; avec la participation de François Paschoud et Claudia Wick; index rédigé par Lavinia Galli Milic*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 47 (Vandoeuvres–Genève 2001)

SCHWINDT, J.P., *Prolegomena zu einer "Phänomenologie" der römischen Literaturge-schichtsschreibung* (Göttingen 2000)

STEINMETZ P., "Gattungen und Epochen der griechischen Literatur in der Sicht Quintilians", *Hermes* 92 (1964) 454–466

SUERBAUM, W. (ed.), *Die archaische Literatur: Von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod*, Handbuch der Lateinischen Literatur der Antike 8. 1 (Munich 2002)

TAPLIN, O (ed.), *Literature in the Greek & Roman worlds. A new perspective* (Oxford 2000)

VOGT-SPIRA G., "Literarische Imitatio und kulturelle Identität", in G. Vogt-Spira – B. Rommel (eds.), *Rezeption und Identität: die kulterelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäische Paradigma* (Stuttgart 1999) 23–37

WILLIAMS, G. *Change and Decline. Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Berkeley 1978)

PART II

BEGINNINGS?

CHAPTER TWO

ANTIQUITY'S ANTIQUITY

SANDER M. GOLDBERG

When does a literature begin, and how do we account for its origin? When should a literature be said to have left its early days behind? Contemporary Latinists, troubled not just by the obscurity of the early Roman literary record but by modern uncertainty over what constitutes a beginning, may find such questions especially difficult, but even among traditional literary histories, those that still suggest with some confidence that Latin literature 'began' in 240 B.C. with Livius Andronicus' plays at the *ludi Romani*, there are obligatory nods to 'pre-literary' activities, to spells, chants, rhymes and hymns, to Livy's dramatic *satura*, to the sayings of Appius Claudius Caecus, or to what were once and are now again called *carmina convivalia*, nods that tacitly acknowledge the complexity of the situation.[1] It is no easier to identify a literature's birth—the biological metaphor comes all too easily to such discussions—than its death.

The Romans' own recurring taste for the past adds a further complication to the problem. Archaism, by which I mean an author's willingness, often even desire, to sound old-fashioned, was a familiar stylistic mannerism. More than a generation before Sallust became famous, in some circles infamous, for archaic affectations, Coelius Antipater was sprinkling his history of the second Punic War with old and poetic words. Authors and antiquarians had much in common—Coelius' history was dedicated to Aelius Stilo, Varro's great teacher—and even Cicero saw a place for diction that made speech *grandior atque anti-*

---

[1] So, e.g., Habinek T., *The Politics of Latin Literature* (Princeton 1998) 34–39 and Goldberg S.M., *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic* (Cambridge 2005) 1–7 suggest different 'beginnings' for Latin literature, but agree on the inadequacy of the traditional view. Suerbaum W. (ed.), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike: Erster Band. Die archaische Literatur*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, viii.1 (Munich 2002) 83–87 addresses the problem of a 'beginning' in 240 B.C., but even for him, Andronicus, Naevius, and Ennius are 'die Archegeten.'

quior.[2] Lucretius' language often recalls Ennius, and Ennius, over one hundred years before *De rerum natura*, was himself an archaizer. Forms like *endo* and *indu* and the neologisms based on them (e.g. *induperator* and *indugredi)* might be explained away as metrical conveniences to increase the poet's options for dactylic rhythms, but when we see the metrically neutral *olle* standing for *ille* in the *Annales*, and, looking back a generation or more before that, the adverb *topper* and the -*as* genitives peeking out from the ruins of Andronicus' *Odusia*, it becomes clear that choice, not just metrical convenience, is an important part of the story.[3] Even the SC de Bacanalibus of 186 B.C. employs not just genuine archaisms like *Duelonai* for *Bellonae* (2) but false ones like *oquoltod* (*oculto*).[4] Archaism thus seems to be nearly as old as Latin literature itself. It was a way to make the legacy of the past legitimize the work of the present.

Though archaism's hint of age might be a valued stylistic ornament, however, old age itself was not a virtue. No author set out to be archaic. That was a label not sought but bestowed. It came only in retrospect, usually with polemic overtones, and could be strikingly unstable. So Ennius, proud of his own metrical innovations, not only disparages his predecessor Naevius for employing the meter of Fauns and soothsayers (*quos olim Faunei vatesque canebant*), but advances himself as the first to be *dicti studiosus*.[5] Yet he did not keep his status as an innovator for long.

---

[2] Cicero, *De Oratore* 3.153. According to Suetonius, *De Grammaticis* 10, the grammarian L. Ateius Philologus compiled lists of archaic words for Sallust, and both Asinius Pollio (10) and Pompey's freedman Lenaeus (15.2) faulted him for using them. See Suetonius, *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, ed. R.A. Kaster (Oxford 1995) ad loc. and the discussions by Syme R., *Sallust* (Berkeley 1964) 258–262 and Lebek W.D., *Verba Prisca. Die Anfänge des Archaisierens in der lateinischen Beredsamkeit und Geschichtsschreibung*, Hypomnemata 25 (Göttingen 1970) 315–335, 217–223. Word lists facilitate archaism without the risk of actually being archaic.

[3] *T. Lucreti Cari* De rerum natura *libri sex*, ed. W.L. Leonard – S.B. Smith (Madison 1942) 131–139 provide full discussion of archaism in Lucretius. For Ennius, see Annals *of Quintus Ennius*, ed. O. Skutsch (Oxford 1985) 227–228 (*induperator*), 454 (*indu*), 64–66 (*olle*). It seems impossible to determine whether Ennius' taste for the archaic accusative pronoun forms *sum, sam*, and *sos* is driven more by technical or aesthetic considerations, see Skutsch, *Annals* 64. That may not be a question Ennius would himself have understood.

[4] *Neiquis* (3) is often taken as another false archaism, but see Vine B., *Studies in Archaic Latin Inscriptions* (Innsbruck 1993) 255–256. The most recent text and linguistic commentary in English is Courtney E., *Archaic Latin Prose*, American Philological Association Classical Studies 42 (Atlanta 1999) 93–101.

[5] Ennius, *Annales* 206–209, with the discussion of Skutsch, *Annals* (note 3) 370–375. Ennius' complaint was evidently confined to stylistic matters: he does not seem to have retold at any length Naevius' story of the First Punic War.

Horace, who held a similar view of the Saturnian (*horridus Saturnius*, *Epistulae* 2.1.156–160), was hardly less disparaging of *Ennius*, and Ovid a generation later could find nothing more uncouth than the *Annales* (*nihil hirsutius*, *Tristia* 2.259). For Romans looking back on their literary heritage, the 'archaic' was an expanding category with loose chronological boundaries and no specific stylistic markers. What seems to unite archaic authors in the Romans' own reckoning of them is a grudging tolerance of their achievements: so Cicero manufactures praise for Cato (*Brutus* 294) and Horace recommends making allowances for Lucilius (*Saturae* 1.10.64–71). The extreme example of Republican indulgence of this kind is Volcacius Sedigitus, who included Ennius in his famous canon of comic poets purely *antiquitatis causa*—and put him last.[6]

Modern critics have been hardly more precise and scarcely more comfortable in defining the boundaries of the archaic. The first volume of the new *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, for example, is dedicated to 'Die archaische Literatur,' which its editor (Werner Suerbaum) defines as extending 'von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod' and then further specifies as embracing 'die vorliterarische Periode und die Zeit von 240 bis 78 v. Chr.' By that measure, however, 'Die archaische Literatur' is clearly not one, easily recognized corpus, and if we press for greater precision in the terms, we will discover that every word of the title page, perhaps even *von* and *bis*, is in one way or another problematic. Anomalies are thus almost inevitable. The convenient historical terminus of Sulla's death, for example, has the effect of implicitly labeling Cicero's first surviving speeches, the *Pro Quinctio* and *Pro Roscio Amerino*, 'archaic,' though neither is in fact treated in this volume.[7] Gian Biagio Conte, to cite another literary historian alive to the theoretical implication of his choices, makes a different, but equally striking division between the archaic and what follows it when he writes:[8]

> …the lesson of Hellenism seems the deepest one in archaic Latin poetry, however mediated by the Roman context. And when Latin literature,

---

[6] Volcacius in Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 15.24. Note that for the modernist Aper in Tacitus, *Dialogus de oratoribus* 17, *antiquus* is itself a problematic label.

[7] Cicero is reserved for the second volume. Suerbaum, *Handbuch* (note 1) 3–10 recognizes the artificiality of its parameters. The new Blackwell *Companion to Latin Literature* edited by Stephen Harrison (Oxford 2005) ix–x puts the boundary between 'early' and 'late' Republican literature at 90 B.C., i.e. between Lucilius and Cicero, the fragmentary and the whole. It avoids the word 'archaic.'

[8] Conte G.B., *Latin Literature: A History* (Baltimore 1994) 7–8.

with the Augustans, goes on to choose a modern and different original-
ity, the polemics it directs against the ancients of the Roman tradition
(who are now seen as insufficiently accurate mediators of Greek form
and style) will aim, paradoxically, at establishing contact with the true
ancients, those distant Greeks who seemed to be the creators of the very
first literature of all: Homer, Hesiod, Alcaeus, Archilochus, Pindar, and
the other great lyric poets.

Conte's elision of the late Republic—he takes us straight from 'archaic
Latin poetry' to 'the Augustans'—reflects not simply the difficulty of
placing a complex, multi-faceted innovator like Catullus in a historical
scheme but the discontents that inevitably arise when we start assigning
literary phenomena to periods. The problem in this particular passage,
which is in other respects valuable and astute, lies not in what Conte
says, but in what he must leave out when saying it.

Yet the very fluidity of the boundary between the archaic and its
successor, along with the values assigned to archaic authors, had great
utility for Romans who thought about texts. Here, for example, is some
of Cicero's praise for the oratory of the elder Cato (*Brutus* 68):

> His diction is a little old-fashioned and his vocabulary a little rough,
> but that is the way people spoke in those days. Change that, which
> he could not then do, and add rhythm and, to make the speech more
> graceful, arrange the words in a more elegant order, which not even the
> ancient Greeks used to do: you would then find nobody preferable to
> Cato.[9]

Atticus will later point out the absurdity of casting Cato as the Roman
Lysias (*risum vix tenebam, cum Attico Lysiae Catonem nostrum comparabas*,
293), but there is more to this passage than a clumsy attempt to tai-
lor the history of Roman oratory to the requirements of a Greek evo-
lutionary model. What is acknowledged here as lacking in Cato—word
choice, rhythm, and phraseology—are precisely the qualities that define
modernity for Cicero.[10] The inadequacy of the past makes it possible to

---

[9] Cicero, *Brutus* 68: 'Antiquior est huius sermo et quaedam horridiora verba. Ita
enim tum loquebantur. Id muta, quod tum ille non potuit, et adde numeros et ut aptior
sit oratio, ipsa verba compone et quasi coagmenta, quod ne Graeci quidem veteres
factitaverunt: iam neminem antepones Catoni.'

[10] Cf. *Brutus* 274 on the orator Calidius and *Orator* 149, *De Oratore* 3.171–181 on
composition. For the teleological tendencies of the *Brutus* and the resulting problems
for literary history, see Goldberg S.M., *Epic in Republican Rome* (Oxford 1995) 5–12,
Hinds S., *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge 1998) 63–69, Schwindt J.P., *Prolegomena zu
einer 'Phänomenologie' der römischen Literaturgeschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Quintilian*,
Hypomnemata 130 (Göttingen 2000) 106–116.

recognize the characteristic achievements of the present. The archaic is the un-modern.

Maintain that juxtaposition of old and new while reversing the values assigned to them, and the existence of an archaic period may launch an argument for decline, always an attractive option for a culture that, like the Romans, defined its ancestors as being in so many ways *maiores*. This is the critical mentality that Horace would ridicule in his letter to Augustus.

> It annoys me that something is faulted not because it is obtusely or inelegantly wrought but because it is recent, while not indulgence but praise and prizes are sought for old things.[11]

As in the *Brutus*, discussion of the past comes couched in the critical vocabulary of the present (here *crasse, illepide*, and just above this passage, *emendata, pulchra*). The truth of the criticism is problematic. Horace may only be inventing this battle between ancients and moderns. The palpable influence of his *Odes* on the third book of Propertius, for example, hardly supports his claim that the odes went unappreciated by contemporaries, and even if Ovid's recollection of lively poetic exchanges in the Rome of his youth owes more to nostalgia than truth (*Tristia* 4.10.43–54), the fact of the Augustan aesthetic settlement remains uncontested. The utility of the 'ancients' for Horace as a point of reference for a defense of modernity is thus all the more striking.

From the perspective of our own modernity, however, the 'archaic' label entails more dangers than advantages. First, the evolutionary model it so readily encourages can give the fact of change over time an air not just of progress, but of inevitability. Yet such models, perhaps especially the familiar biological models of literary development that lead to talk of seed-planting, growth and maturity can be very misleading. That is sometimes easy enough to see on the grand scale. Ennius' *Annales*, for example, no doubt helped make the *Aeneid* as we know it possible, but nobody would seriously argue that the *Annales* contained within itself the 'seed' of Vergil's poem. The course of Latin epic after Ennius was not determined *by* Ennius. Other forces came into play, everything from the artistic failure of Ennius' immediate successors to the importation of Alexandrian poetic values to the innovations

---

[11] Horace, *Epistulae* 2.1. 76–78: 'indignor quidquam reprehendi, non quia crasse / compositum illepideve putetur, sed quia nuper, / nec veniam antiquis, sed honorem et praemia posci.'

of Vergil's contemporaries, that had only a little to do with Ennius' own
accomplishments. The two poems can be profitably compared, but they
also demand separate treatment.

The same necessity applies on the small scale, where the tempta-
tion to assume 'growth' or 'progress' may be greater, with a corre-
sponding cost to appreciation of the earlier work. Eduard Norden,
for example, confidently claimed that when Cato in a speech wrote,
*homines defoderunt in terram dimidiatos ignemque circumposuerunt, ita interfe-
cerunt* ('They buried the men up to their waists in the ground and
put fire around them: thus they killed them'), Cicero would have writ-
ten *homines in terram defossos igni circumposito interfecerunt* ('They killed the
men buried in the ground by means of fire set around them').[12] The
issue, however, is not simply the historical one of whether or to what
degree prose writers of the second century had predicative partici-
ples and ablative absolutes at their disposal. Cato's syntactic choices
were almost certainly more limited than Cicero's a century later, but
that is not the only matter of importance here. There is a rhetorical
value to Cato's λέξις εἰρομένη—we can practically hear the pause and
then the indignant lingering over *ita*—that is lost in the bland com-
pression of Norden's revision. Its syntactic complexity is pointless in a
way that genuine Ciceronian compression is not, e.g. *Pro Cluentio* 187,
Stratonem quidem, iudices, in crucem esse actum exsecta scitote lingua ('Know,
judges, that Strato, fixed to the cross, had his tongue severed'), where
the word order and the rhythmic clausula it makes possible heighten
the horror of the description. Cicero's use of participles varies with
content and genre, and in speeches, as Eric Laughton observes, 'He
used them to achieve not conciseness of form, but fullness and preg-
nancy of content.'[13] Norden is not so much wrong in his facts as
in their application—and in the confidence of his conclusion, which
owes less to the facts than to his reluctance to find artistry in the 'ar-
chaic' Cato.

A failure like this to assess fully the achievements of an author whose
work is now in fragments suggests a second danger in dealing with 'the

---

[12] Norden E., *Die antiken Kunstprosa* I (Leipzig 1918) 166, 'Cicero geschrieben hätte.'
The fragment, 193M is from a speech that Malcovati dates to 150 B.C. Norden's survey
notes considerable variation in Cato's prose style, though the contribution of formal
(Greek) rhetoric to this variety remains controversial. See Leeman A.D., *Orationis ratio*
(Amsterdam 1963) 45–49, Albrecht M. von, *Masters of Roman Prose from Cato to Apuleius*
(Leeds 1989) 18–20.

[13] Laughton E., *The Participle in Cicero* (Oxford 1964) 145.

archaic.' The distance of archaic authors from us often combines with
the problematic quality of their texts to distract from the merits of what,
had history moved in a different direction, might now be regarded
not as clumsiness but as brilliant innovation. It is only a teleological
bias that identifies abandoned alternatives with aesthetic failures. In
the case of early Roman epic, for example, it is certainly true that
Ennius' success with the dactylic hexameter consigned the Saturnian
to obscurity and that Vergil in turn left many of Ennius' innovations
in diction and rhythm far behind, but such facts of literary history
do not mean that the archaic practices were in themselves inherently
unaesthetic. There is certainly something to be said for progress and
for scholarly efforts to document literary change over time, though this
means encouraging us to see Naevius largely as Ennius saw him and
Ennius in turn as Vergil saw him. That tells us something important
about Ennius and then about Vergil. The problem comes when we
mistake that part of the story for the whole story, when we allow
Ennius' judgment to substitute for a more independent view of what
Naevius accomplished or to let Vergil do the same for Ennius. As
Stephen Hinds rightly observes,

> It is not that we should deny to the ancient poets…the right to carve
> out cultural space for themselves by consigning their predecessors to the
> dustbin, or the archiving room, of literary history. What we should worry
> about is how unreflectively we modern literary historians sometimes
> repeat their moves… Especially in the case of early writers who have
> come down to us only in fragments and stripped of many of their original
> contexts, we are often too ready to define them in the terms in which
> their more canonical successors defined them, without attempting to put
> some space between those interested evaluations and our own.

Recent scholarship has begun the work of recuperating these fragmen-
tary texts as aesthetic objects, reconstructing what can be known of
their contexts, and making their place in Roman literary history as
much a destination in its own right as a way station on the road to
Vergil. There is therefore satisfaction and even a little pride in recogniz-
ing in Hinds' perceptive discussion less a challenge to prevailing views
than the articulation of an emerging one.[14]

---

[14] Hinds, *Allusion* (note 10) 55–56. Examples of the new trend include, in addition
to Hinds' own palmary discussion at 52–63, Goldberg, *Epic* (note 10) 58–110; Rüpke
J., "Kulturtransfer als Rekodierung: Zum literaturgeschichtlichen und sozialen Ort der
frühen römischen Epik," in J. Rüpke (ed.), *Von Göttern und Menschen erzählen. Formkon-
stanzen und Funktionswandel moderner Epik* (Stuttgart 2001) 42–46; Zetzel J.E.G., "Dream-

It is still the case, however, that a fragmentary record can be all
too easily ignored. This is generally so not because we forget that
it exists, but because other interests, other values, and other, more
tractable kinds of evidence gain prominence in our thinking. The schol-
arly response to Dido in *Aeneid* 4 is an obvious example of this tendency.
The fact of her tragedy in that book is beyond argument, and Vergil
explicitly likens her to familiar figures of the tragic stage, Pentheus
and Orestes, in a strikingly overt theatrical allusion (4.469–473). Mod-
ern commentators inevitably recall Euripides and Aeschylus but tend
to forget that the Pentheus and Orestes best known to Vergil and his
Roman audience were not the creations of fifth-century Athens. These
may define the idea of tragedy for us, but Republican Rome enjoyed
a Hellenistic form of tragedy that reveled in stage effects and values
quite different from its classical ancestor. We therefore need to be think-
ing much less of Euripides and Aeschylus when assessing Dido than of
Ennius, Pacuvius, and Accius, whose plays on the themes of Orestes
and Pentheus had become classics of the Roman stage by the late first
century. Even if Vergil himself, about as *doctus* a poet as we are likely
to meet in the Roman tradition, had in fact gone back to fifth-century
texts for his characterization of Dido, he was still reading those plays
through a Hellenistic filter that remains difficult for us to reconstruct.[15]
And his readers, of course, knew that later kind of tragedy almost exclu-
sively.

---

ing About Quirinus: Horace's *Satires* and the Development of Augustan Poetry," in
T. Woodman – D. Feeney (eds.), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (Cambridge
2002) 38–52.

[15] Vergil's learning is noted by Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 5.18–19, 6.1 and finds its way
into Servius' notes *ad Aeneid* 469–473 (including a mention of Pacuvius). For the hall-
marks of Hellenistic tragedy, see Tarrant R.J., "Senecan Drama and Its Antecedents,"
Harvard Stud. Class. Philology 82 (1978) 213–216; Easterling P.E., "From Repertoire to
Canon," in P.E. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge
1997) 211–227. The tragic influences in the Dido story as detected by Wlosok A.,
"Vergils Didotragödie. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Tragischen in der *Aeneis*," in
H. Görgemanns – E.A. Schmidt (ed.), *Studien zum antiken Epos* (Meisenheim 1976)
228–250 sound Hellenistic (e.g a five-act structure), but the modern tendency is to
look further back into tragedy's history. Noteworthy examples include Harrison E.L.,
"The Tragedy of Dido," *Echos du Monde Classique* 8 (1989) 1–21; Hardie P., "Virgil and
Tragedy" in C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge 1997)
312–326; Galinsky K., "Greek and Roman Drama and the *Aeneid*," in D. Braund –
C. Gill (ed.), *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome. Studies in Honour of T.P. Wiseman*
(Exeter 2003) 275–294. See now Goldberg, *Constructing Literature* (note 1) 115–122.

  Keeping fragmentary models in view is not a difficulty confined to
the reading of poetry. The deliberative speech that Sallust ascribes to
Caesar in his *Bellum Catilinae*, for example, begins like this:

> All men, conscript fathers, who deliberate over controversial matters,
> need to empty themselves of hatred, friendship, anger, and pity. The
> mind does not easily see the truth when these come into play, nor
> does anyone of us simultaneously obey impulse and advantage. When
> intellect triumphs, the mind does well. If impulse takes control, the mind
> is mastered and accomplishes nothing. I have a great store of memories,
> conscript fathers, of kings and peoples who chose badly when driven by
> anger or pity. But I prefer to recount things our ancestors did rightly and
> properly against the impulse of their own minds.[16]

The internal echo of Sallust's own preface is manifest, and the *sine
ira et studio* theme had a long history in Greek by Sallust's day (e.g.
Thucydides 3.42.1; Demosthenes *De Chersoneso* 1), but the echo that
would have been most obvious to Sallust's audience at this point—
or to Caesar's own audience, for that matter—is the one least often
noted by modern commentators. Though it has become a scholarly
truism that Sallust learned to be Thucydidean by sounding like the
elder Cato, discussion of that debt generally centers on specific word
choices, forms, and spelling. It requires a wider perspective to note
that Caesar's preamble as Sallust reconstructs it deliberately varies the
theme developed by Cato when addressing the Senate on the Rhodian
crisis of 167:

> I know it is common for many men, when circumstances are supportive
> and favorable and agreeable, that the spirit rises and that arrogance and
> presumption grow and swell. It is a great concern for me now, since this
> matter has gone so favorably, lest our deliberations lead to a mistake,
> which may overturn our favorable circumstances or lest this joy become
> excessive.[17]

---

[16] Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 51. 1–3: 'Omnis homines, patres conscripti, qui de rebus
dubiis consultant, ab odio, amicitia, ira atque misericordia vacuos esse decet. Haud
facile animus verum providet, ubi illa officiunt, neque quisquam omnium lubidini
simul et usui paruit. Ubi intenderis ingenium, valet; si lubido possidet, ea dominatur,
animus nihil valet. Magna mihi copia est memorandi, patres conscripti, quae reges
atque populi ira aut misericordia inpulsi male consuluerint. Sed ea malo dicere, quae
maiores nostri contra lubidinem animi sui recte atque ordine fecere.'

[17] Cato Maior, fragm. 63M: 'Scio solere plerisque hominibus rebus secundis atque
prolixis atque prosperis animum excellere atque superbiam atque ferociam augescere
atque crescere. Quo mihi nunc magnae curae est, quod haec res tam secunde processit,

The speech was famous in antiquity, not least because Cato included it in the fifth book of his *Origines*, and it became a rhetorical model of sufficient potency that Cicero's freedman Tiro would eventually feel the need to attack it as an oratorical standard.[18] Lest anyone among Sallust's readership miss the reference, Caesar's first historical example is the very debate over Rhodes that Cato dominated. The allusion thus becomes almost explicit.[19] Our most popular modern commentaries on Sallust's monograph nevertheless tend to ignore this association.[20] As so often, fragmentary evidence slips from the record.

Finally, the fact of change may be regarded as a barrier to influence, especially if the end of the 'archaic' period is taken to coincide not with the doings of Romans but with the comings of Greeks, in particular the arrivals of Parthenius and Philodemus in the 70s B.C. Parthenius, we are told, was Vergil's Greek tutor and brought Romans of his generation their knowledge of Callimachus and Euphorion, while Philodemus himself wrote influential epigrams and was a prominent member of that famous Epicurean circle on the bay of Naples, that included Horace as well as Vergil.[21] This ostensible watershed requires some historical perspective, for influence of the kind represented by Parthenius and Philodemus was not in itself new at Rome. Latin literature always owed much to external interventions. Livius Andronicus, a Greek by birth and culture, launched a Latin dramatic tradition by basing it on a Greek one from Magna Graecia, and by explicating Homer in the 160s, the great Pergamene scholar Crates of Mallos stimulated

---

ne quid in consulendo advorsi eveniat, quod nostras secundas res confutet, neve haec laetitia nimis luxuriose eveniat.'

[18] Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 6.3, from which our knowledge of the speech derives. Its existence was also noted by Appianus, *Punica* 65 and Livy, *Ab Urbe condita* 45.25.2.

[19] Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 51.5: 'Bello Macedonico, quod cum rege Perse gessimus, Rhodiorum civitas magna atque magnifica, quae populi Romani opibus creverat, infida et advorsa nobis fuit. Sed postquam bello confecto de Rhodiis consultum est, maiores nostri, ne quis divitiarum magis quam iniuriae causa bellum inceptum diceret, inpunitos eos dimisere.' The recollection is doubtless meant to set up the following speech by Cato's descendant.

[20] Vretska K. (ed.), *De Catilinae coniuratione*, vol. 2. (Heidelberg 1976) 512–519; Ramsey J., *Sallust's* Bellum Catilinae. *Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, American Philological Association Textbook Series 9 (Atlanta 1984) 199–201. McGushin P. (ed.), *C. Sallustius Crispus*: Bellum Catilinae. *A Commentary*, Mnemosyne Supplement 45 (Leiden 1977) 240–242 is a noteworthy exception.

[21] Both Parthenius and Philodemus have attracted serious attention in recent years, with consequent changes in our view of them. See Lightfoot J.L. (ed.), *Parthenius of Nicaea. The Poetical Fragments and the Ἐρωτικὰ Παθήματα* (Oxford 1999) 50–76; Sider D.S. (ed.), *The Epigrams of Philodemos* (Oxford 1997) 3–24.

Romans to recover a native literature of their own that would be capable of withstanding comparable scrutiny.[22] They are hardly unique. The Romans' literary trajectory was never entirely of their own determination. Roman authors were always combining traditions and negotiating their sometimes conflicting demands, with results that even in the early days prefigure the complex intertextual relationships we eventually find between pagan and Christian traditions. While Parthenius and Philodemus may have altered the course of Latin poetry, the model for their influence was assimilation rather than revolution.

We should therefore resist the widespread, though generally tacit assumption that the poetic innovations associated with Catullus and his circle, the so-called 'neoteric movement,' not just made older texts irrelevant to subsequent Latin poetry but that these poets themselves found that older poetry irrelevant or even antithetical to their concerns. It is true that the one epyllion surviving from that time, Catullus 64 on the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, studiously avoids the mannerisms of Roman epic, but just as striking and even more significant for understanding the archaic legacy at Catullus' disposal is the abundant evidence for the stylistic influence on the poem of Roman tragedy. Ennius' play *Medea exul* is much on the poet's mind, and Accian overtones are also discernible. Neoteric polemics directed at the past seem to be specific to certain genres and were, no doubt, especially aimed at their contemporary instantiations.[23] Catullus' cold shoulder is turned not directly against the archaism of Ennius' *Annales*, but against the aesthetic wasteland of those contemporary poets who, like Volusius, continued to write epic in an Ennian style.

Catullus' polymetric poems, which by one reckoning are not properly 'neoteric' at all, negotiate a somewhat different relationship with the Roman past. Catullus 8 ('Miser, Catulle'), for example, borrows heavily from the language of Roman comedy. The list of words with comic associations is too long and too central to deny: *miser, ineptire, rogare, sectari, adire, scelesta, obstinatus, obdurare, destinatus* are most frequently cited.[24] Why the 'Catullus' of this poem should establish himself as

---

[22] For Andronicus, see Gruen E.S., *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy* (Leiden 1990) 80–84, and for Crates, Goldberg, *Constructing Literature* (note 1) 25–28.

[23] Thomas R., "Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (Poem 64.1–18)," *American Journal of Philology* 103 (1982) 144–164 establishes the connection with tragedy in the poem at the expense of epic. On the general problem of Catullus and early Latin poetry, see Goldberg, *Constructing Literature* (note 1) 112–113.

[24] Selden D.L., "Ceveat lector: Catullus and the Rhetoric of Performance," in

another Mnesilochus or Calidorus may be a puzzle, but the fact of
that characterization is beyond doubt. It seems almost perverse to deny
the centrality of the Plautine influence by advocating, as has been
done, a specific Menandrean model for this monologue, where the
speaker is instead an old man rather than a young one, angry rather
than anguished, and resolute rather than vacillating.[25] A similar case
of comic characterization occurs in poem 42, where the poet evokes
a *flagitatio* whose expansions and rhythms are palpably comic, creating
a drama that should be read against the background of a scene like
that at *Pseudolus* 357 ff.[26] Catullus, like Sallust, knew the literary past and
used it to his advantage.

   I have confined myself here to the Republican reception of that past
not because later receptions, like those of the Antonines, are imma-
terial to literary history but because the relationship between archaic
authors and their descendants is especially keen and, for modern schol-
ars, especially problematic in the late Republic. We face not just the
challenge of assessing influence on the basis of limited evidence, but of
dealing with the fact that the late Republican authors who provide so
much of that evidence disguised their own debts, and their own preju-
dices, so well. Not only are the archaic texts on which they built often
fragmentary, but that fragmentary state is itself a consequence of the
archaic label assigned them by their heirs. I have also confined myself
to the reception of what became fragmentary authors, excluding Plau-
tus and Terence, whose texts survived in large part, I believe, because
no later writers of *palliata* comedies emerged in subsequent generations
to eclipse their achievements. Thus, though the two playwrights also
furnished grist for antiquarian mills, they continued to attract attention
for their merit as artists, and not just as linguistic curiosities. That final
fact should at least remind us that 'archaic' does not inevitably mean

R. Hexter – D.L. Selden (ed.), *Innovations of Antiquity* (London 1992) 461–512, here
467–471, though the argument goes back to Morris E.P., "An Interpretation of Cat-
ullus VIII," *Trans. Conn. Acad. Arts and Sciences* 15 (1909) 139–151. For the restriction of
the 'neoteric' label to hexameter poetry, see Lyne R.O.A.M., "The Neoteric Poets,"
Classical Quarterly 28 (1978) 167–187.
   [25] Thus Thomas R., "Menander and Catullus 8," *Rheinisches Museum* 127 (1984)
308–316, adducing Demeas' monologue at Menander *Samia* 325–356. There is no
particular reason to think that Catullus would have read more Menander than Plautus.
Skinner M.B., "Catullus 8: The Comic *Amator* as *Eiron*," *Classical Journal* 66 (1971)
298–305 makes a direct and credible association with Plautus. See further Goldberg,
Constructing Literature (note 1) 100–102.
   [26] Goldberg, *Constructing Literature* (note 1) 107–112.

'superseded,' and that archaic works might be something more than steppingstones to other, possibly better things. Archaic texts can have an integrity and an aesthetic value all their own, and their importance to literary history is definable in other ways than mere chronological sequence. There is more to a beginning than just a start.

Select Bibliography

GOLDBERG S.M., *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic* (Cambridge 2005)

HABINEK T., *The Politics of Latin Literature* (Princeton 1998)

HINDS S., *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge 1998)

LEBEK W.D., *Verba Prisca. Die Anfänge des Archaisierens in der lateinischen Beredsamkeit und Geschichtsschreibung*, Hypomnemata 25 (Göttingen 1970)

LEEMAN A.D., *Orationis ratio* (Amsterdam 1963)

LYNE R.O.A.M, "The Neoteric Poets," *Classical Quarterly* 28 (1978) 167–187

NORDEN E., *Die antiken Kunstprosa I* (Leipzig 1918)

SCHWINDT J.P., *Prolegomena zu einer 'Phänomenologie' der römischen Literaturgeschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Quintilian*, Hypomnemata 130 (Göttingen 2000)

SUERBAUM W. (ed.), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antik: Erster Band. Die archaische Literatur*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, viii.1 (Munich 2002)

INTERCULTURAL IMITATION IN CHRISTIAN LATIN POETRY AS A WAY TO THE MEDIEVAL POETICS OF ALTERITY[*]

Francesco Stella

For some years trends in neo-historicism have been renewing the issue 'continuity and change' concerning literary history: the old question, raised in 1992 by David Perkins *Is Literary History Possible?*,[1] elicits new answers in the field of ancient literatures as well. As far as the history of Latin texts is concerned, the problem of the relationship between epochs has to be taken into consideration according to these critical perspectives: a traditional periodization, depending on studies in institutional history, imposed the three labels of classic, medieval and humanistic, which in recent times have often been put into question. A very sophisticated debate about this subject started in the seventies, inspired by the philosophical paradigms of Blumenberg, Kuhn and Luhmann,[2] and it evoked some important contributions on late-antique and medieval culture.[3] Multiple periodizations, asynchronic cultural

---

[*] Part of this contribution has been published in M. Paschalis (ed.), *Roman and Greek Imperial Epic* (Rethymnon 2005) 131–147.

[1] The best witness in this sense is the 49/2 issue of *Les Annales* (1994), dedicated to *Littérature et histoire*, edited by Christian Jouhaud.

[2] See Müller S., *Paradigmenwechsel und Epochenwandel—Zur Struktur wissenschaftshistorischer und geschichtlicher Mobilität bei Thomas S. Kuhn, Hans Blumenberg und Hans Freyer*, *Saeculum* 32 (1981) 1–30; Blumenberg H., *Die Legitimität der Neuzeit* (Frankfurt / Main 1966); Luhmann N., *Das Problem der Epochenbildung und die Evolutionstheorie* in H.U. Gumbert – U. Link-Heer (eds.), *Epochenschwellen und Epochenstrukturen im Diskurs der Literatur- und Sprachtheorie* (Frankfurt / Main 1985) 11–33. See also Jauss H.R., *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft* (Konstanz 1967) It. trans. A. Vàrvaro, *Perché la storia della letteratura?* (Naples 1970). German scholars, together with Russians, have produced the most advanced observations on these topics, recovered by other scholars after the appearance of the English translations of Blumenberg and Bakhtin in the 90s, due to a more deeply rooted Hegelian and Droysenian awareness of the relationship between historic epochs.

[3] H. Trümpy (ed.), *Kontinuität—Diskontinuität in der Geisteswissenschaft* (Darmstadt 1973); P.E. Hubinger (ed.), *Kulturbruch oder Kulturkontinuität im Übergang von der Antike*

series and deep differences between the way historical ages are viewed by modern or contemporary eyes are by now a granted factum, at least among scholars, though not yet part of the collective consciousness.

Probably, one of the most innovative contributions by the recent literary theories to the historiography of antique literature, is the assumption that interference among cultures can also be a criterion for literary analysis. This intuition, already elaborated by Momigliano (*Alien Wisdom* 1975), is now widespread in historiographic publications, even though it is not yet widely accepted in literary interpretations. If it is true, as the Russian critics have long been underlining, that 'it is not possibile for a culture to progress without an external stream of texts' and that every external contribution 'is a factor of acceleration in the literary development',[4] then it might become possible to think about a literary history which is finally free from the romantic and colonial concept of 'source'. This approach would create more flexible landscapes, based on jaussian and bachtinian concepts of creative reception and retroaction, interference and polyphony, responsivity and exotopy. A literature as Latin literature, of which Rémi Brague[5] recently claimed that it is founded on a constitutive 'secondariness', is effectively well suited to such an analysis.

---

zum Mittelalter (Darmstadt 1968); Hubinger P.E., *Zur Frage der Periodengrenze zwischen Altertum und Mittelalter* (Darmstadt 1969); Wendorff R., *Zeit und Kultur. Geschichte der Zeitbewusstseins in Europa* (Opladen 1980[2]); Petrikovits H. von, *Der diachorische Aspekt der Kontinuität von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter*, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse (Göttingen 1982); Cameron A., *Continuity and change in sixth-century Byzantium* (reprint: London 1981) and the excellent miscellany R. Herzog – R. Koselleck (eds.), *Epochenschwelle und Epochenbewusstsein* (Munich 1987). More recently R.J. Bast-A.C. Gow (eds.), *Continuity and Change: the harvest of late medieval and Reformation history: essays presented to Heiko A. Oberman on his 70th birthday* (Leiden–Boston 2000); N. Langreiter (ed.), *Kontinuität-Wandel: kulturwissenschaftliche Versuche über ein schwieriges Verhältnis* (Wien 2002).

[4] V.M. Žirmunskij, quoted in Lotman J., *Una teoria del rapporto reciproco fra le culture*, in *La semiosfera* (Venice 1985) 114. On this issue and on the application of this approach to the classic and medieval literatures I have proposed some comments in Stella F., *Eteroglossia del testo e comparazione interculturale*, in *Interculturalità. Antropologia Religioni Letteratura*, special issue of *Testimonianze* 384–385 (1995) 99–122, reprinted in *Semicerchio. Rivista di poesia comparata* 14 (1996) 2–14, and in the chapter *Antichità Europee* in A. Gnisci (ed.), *Letteratura comparata* (Milano 2002) 31–61, Spanish version in *Introducción a la literatura comparada* (Barcelona 2002) 71–127.

[5] Brague, R., *Il futuro dell'Occidente. Nel modello romano la salvezza dell'Europa*. It. trans. A. Soldati – A.M. Lorusso (Milano 2005).

Since Erich Auerbach's *Mimesis* of 1948, it became common knowledge in the field of literary criticism that different narrative models and different tools of artistic and poetic expression correspond to diverse cultures or world views. His famous comparison of the episode of Ulysses' scar and the sacrifice of Isaac[6] highlighted the radical difference between two descriptive worlds and stimulated a deeper (because implicitly comparative) analysis of the cultural influences upon the literary technique of antiquity. Important works have developed the parallel study of biblical narrative on the one hand,[7] and Homeric and post-Homeric on the other.[8] It is only recently, however, that energy dedicated to the comparative intercultural research has permitted an examination of the *intersections* of the two stylistic modes: I am referring specifically to experimental works—from Nonnos of Panopolis to Eliot and Péguy—which propose solutions to the problem that lies embedded between the second and fourth centuries: *how to create a code adapted to either Semitic or hellenosemitic expression, using tools belonging to the western tradition, which is Greek and above all Latin.*

An initial solution, and one which has remained theoretical, was that of demonstrating the two styles to be incompatible: Hieronymus and Augustine at times sustained this approach; Tertullian did so with a certain radical violence. European Classicism of the post-seventeen-hundreds voiced this very same thesis. An identical position was likewise clearly enunciated, in the same year that the *Mimesis* appeared, by Ernst Robert Curtius in his *European Literature and Latin Middle Ages*. But the social impracticability of such a drastic division of the two cultures had already brought about the theory's very demise, through abandonment, as early as the fourth century, with the exception of occasional medieval reappearances.

---

[6] To my opinion Segal's criticisms are partial and unjustified. See the article "Classics and Comparative Culture", *Materiali e discussioni* 19 (1984) 9–21. A discussion of the argument can be found in Stella F., *Antichità europee* (note 5) 39.

[7] One thinks of what are by now classic texts such as Alter R., *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York 1981), or Alter R – Kermode F., *The Literary Guide to the Bible* (Cambridge 1987). A panorama of these studies can be found in Ceserani R., *Brevi appunti sulla riscoperta della Bibbia come grande testo letterario*, in F. Stella (ed.), *La Scrittura infinita. Bibbia e poesia in età romantica e contemporanea* (Florence 1999) 19–38, and Stella F., *Ad supplementum sensus. Pluralità ermeneutica e incremento di senso nella poetica biblica dal Medioevo a Derrida. Le ragioni di un convegno*, in F. Stella (ed.), *La Scrittura infinita. Bibbia e poesia in età romantica e contemporanea* (Florence 2001) 1–17.

[8] Hölscher U., *Die Odyssee. Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman* (Munich 1988).

A second solution, also minimally pursued, was manifested in poetry through the process of making a Latin calque of the biblical style, specifically Psalmic: this is the solution, for example, found in the text of the Papirus Barcinonensis published in 1968 by Roca-Puig, the so-called *Psalmus Responsorius*; or likewise in the hymns of Marius Victorinus. Yet the distance that separated this response from the sophisticated expectations of the cultured Roman audience would bring about its failure.

The third solution, that which would give rise to the 'third poetic cycle of western literature'[9] beside the Homeric and Carolingian–Arthurian ones, is represented by biblical poetry. The writings of Proba, Juvencus, Cyprian, Sedulius, Dracontius, Avitus, Arator and others constituted relatively early a canon that would dominate the medieval and even the humanist circles, and would later reach its apex in Counter-Reformation religious culture, only to vanish during the Enlightenment. This was a literary thread that, after being implicated in the discredit connected with the classicist pre-conception on late imperial decadence, has now for some time been embraced by the explosive interest in this period and its literature. One reason for the revived curiosity in Christian poetry of Late Antiquity is, in fact, precisely the interaction of emerging cultures, including Germanic but above all biblical-Semitic, with Greco-Roman civilization and with its established modes of expression. Consequently, much research has been dedicated to the exploration of the role played by imitation between the *Bibeldichter* and the Augustan poets or the post-Vergilian epic, but nearly always under a viewpoint of 'Quellenforschung', of recognition of the re-use and reconstruction of hypothetical intertexts.[10] This flourishing of studies created a space which makes a study of compositional techniques of the Christian poets in intercultural terms possible. Starting from this perspective, the old question of imitative connections, and of imitative or intertextual typologies can be explored from new angles previously unexamined. As Michail Bakhtin stated, if the dialogical exchange at the heart of every proposition necessarily assumes the traits of an intercultural exchange, then the creative understanding which observes and re-uses tradition from an external point of view is the most powerful

---

[9] As expressed by Herzog R., *Die Bibelepik der lateinischen Spätantike. Geschichte einer erbaulichen Gattung* (Munich 1975).

[10] For such questions see F. Stella (ed.), *La Scrittura infinita: bibbia e poesia in età medievale e umanistica* (Florence 2001).

tool for the grasp of a culture's heritage in order to gain access to its true communicative potential.[11]

What problems arise from the study of imitative technique between the post-Vergilian legacy and biblical re-writing? A first issue, and one thoroughly examined by German scholars such as Herzog, Thraede and his disciples—who also institutionalized a specific terminology not easily translatable in either Italian or English—concerns the functions and the operative modalities of the revival of pagan epic.

While Thraede's categories—contraposition, substitutive transposition, opposing imitation and spiritualizing inclusion—are to be subscribed in their schematic simplicity, they also reflect a cultural itinerary of passage from direct juxtaposition to gradual integration, more than they describe a specific compositional poetic process.[12] A more subtle approach is that of Reinhart Herzog, who in 1975 applied the *form-*

---

[11] Three privileged perspectives can be discerned for further investigation on intertextuality as intercultural phenomenon: the relations of Greece with the Orient, masterfully explored in West M., *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford 1997). The relations of Rome with Greece have been studied by Momigliano and his successors, until the recent miscellany, G. Vogt-Spira – B. Rommel (eds.), *Rezeption und Identität: die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma* (Stuttgart 1999). A panorama of these scholarly perspectives can be found in Stella F., *Antichità Europee* (note 5). For a more recent application of Bakhtin method to the ancient literatures, see R.B. Branham (ed.), *Bakhtin and the Classics* (Evanston, Il. 2002).

[12] Thraede K., "Epos", *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* V (1960) 1034–1041. The phases of the interpretatory process for prechristian elements in theological literature are the following (ibid, 1006–1014):

– Antithesis and recognition, above all refering to the mythology initially rejected en bloc but then adopted as a moral example (Aeneas as a model of the Christian) or as a list of proverbial phrases (Lucan, VII. 819 *caelo tegitur, qui non habet urnam*);
– transposition, above all begun by Lactantius: he interprets epic deeds and locution in a Christian sense, such as the hymn to Epicurus in Lucretius, in *Divinae institutiones* VII. 27. 6 or *Iovis omnia plena* (*Aeneid* 6. 724). Two methods are discussed: on the one hand spiritualisation or generalisation, and on the other hand transposition of concepts and ambivalent formulae.
– interpolation: Christian interpolation, as Traube defined it: *prolem sancta de coniuge natam* (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 15. 835) became *de virgine natam* in a ms. of the thirteenth century.
– contamination: for example, *Eclogue* 3. 60 and *Aeneid* 6. 726–727 juxtaposes *Iuppiter* and *spiritus*, according to a method previously studied by Hagendahl H., "Methods of citation in postclassical Latin", *Eranos* 45 (1947) 114–128, or more specifically concerning a biblical (*Matthew* 10. 41: "Qui recipit prophetam in nomine prophetae, mercedem prophetae accipiet: et qui recipit iustum in nomine iusti, mercedem iusti accipiet") and a pagan passage (*Aeneid* 6. 661–664: "Quique sa-

geschichtliche readings of the Konstanz school to the formative period of the Christian poetic language. His reconstruction, taking dozens of pages in his *Bibelepik*, examines all stages of the imitative process, whether in prose or poetry, thus providing a framework that was extremely analytical but not exempt from the overlapping or reintroducing, into different classes, of forms which were actually analogous to or hardly distinct from one another. It gradually becomes clear that this process can be recognized as an 'inclusion of the not-accepted' ('Einschluss des nicht Akzeptierten', p. 193), the acceptance of foreign bodies through correction, cutting, or dissolving; usurpation without modification, decontextual neutralization (*tum vero manifesta fides, Aeneid* 2. 309 〉 Juvencus 4. 754), actualization of metaphor (that is, a return to its literal meaning: *tabe peresos* in *Aeneid* 6. 442 said of love is taken literally by Juvencus 1, 440), until the extreme case of a double neutralization: *eripit a femine gladium, quem veste tegebat*, that contaminates (conflates) *Aeneid* 10. 788 and 6. 406, had already been created by Ausonius *Cupido cruciatus* 10 (*Imminutio*) vs. 15 and by Luxorius in the erotic sense, but is recovered, or remade by Cyprian the poet (*Iudices* 178) in the literal sense.

Herzog proceeds with a finesse equivalent to the tortured complexity of his German into unexplored territory: on the one hand, the explanation of the Bible through epic quotations, on the other, the retroaction of the 'foreign bodies' of classical paganism upon the elaboration or at least the formulation of the content of the new Christian literary culture.[13] One must only think of the account of the subterranean world and in general of the hereafter, whether heaven or hell, but also of the influx of elegiac language in the description of female biblical characters and specifically of the erotic language in the expression of *amor dei* examined by Schmid in *Tityrus christianus*.[14]

---

cerdotes casti, dum vita manebat, / quique pii vates et Phoebo digna locuti, / inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artis / omnibus his nivea cinguntur tempora vitta") as happens in Augustine, *Civitas Dei* 21. 27.

[13] The minimal pattern he identified is, for example, the reuse of linguistic ready-made phrases, from those of a proverbial nature to the repertory of scenes, such as 'the danger of death', 'the lord and the knight', 'the armour of gold', or epic epiphets, above all in the paraphrasing of the historical books of the Bible known as the *Heptateuch*. On the other hand, the antipagan poetic citations previously described by Thraede have demonstrative functions.

[14] Schmid W., "Tityrus christianus", *Rheinisches Museum* 96 (1953) 101–165, reprinted in K. Gamber (ed.), *Europäische Bukolik und Georgik* (Darmstadt 1976) 44–121. Stella F.,

To cite Michail Bakhtin once more: 'In language there no longer exists any neutral word or form … every word and every form is imbued with intentions.'[15] In fact, imitative dynamics configure not only a process of elaboration of codes, but a real intervention that moulds cultural content. Herzog documented the process of romanization that marked certain elements of the evangelical narrative in the Vergilian cento of Proba or in Cyprian's *Heptateuchos*, the paraphrasis of the first seven books of the Old Testament. Jesus' position at the banquet is reclining (4. 410), and Joshua's enemies are killed on the cross instead on a tree (*Ioshua* 357–358): 'Immediately, they were fixed on the cross, hanging there bloodless until the falling of black night.'[16] The Palestinian landscape is reinterpreted following patterns of epic Roman expression by Juvencus 1. 130 (John in the desert): 'From now on the boy led always a life, hidden in remote valleys.'[17] Or by Cyprian in *Exodus* 637 (the expedition of Israel into the desert, presented as a grassy steppe): 'Nothing but grasses waving in the winds' blowing.'.[18] Finally, the earthly paradise is described using terminology particular to the Roman palace (*Genesis* 50. 54). In the same fashion Adam and Eve's relationship, in both Dracontius' *De laudibus Dei* and Marius Victor's *Alethia* (1. 385–398), is immediately configured as a conjugal union in terms that represent the Roman legal reality (such as the equality between spouses and the joining of wills) more than the Semitic reality.

Likewise remarkable, but less evident, is the negation of specifically Hebrew traits in a synthetic paraphrase such as the epic type of Juvencus or, less frequently, through the substitution with codifications more customary to the reader, or at least to the expressive code of the Roman epic—for example the concrete form of eschatology interpreted in the abstract spiritual sense of Juvencus 1. 314 ff.—or with the selection of only the common traits shared with Christian culture (for instance, in Juvencus 1. 117 ss., the *Benedictus*, the Old Testament references are

---

"La poesia biblica come problema interculturale: saggi sulle creazioni di Eva", *Semicerchio. Rivista di poesia comparata* 20–21 (1999) 28–32.

[15] Bakhtin M., *Slovo v romane* (1934–1935) partially published in "Voprosy literatury" 6 (1972), then in *Voprosy literatury i estetiki* (Moskva 1975). It. trans. C. Strada Janovič, *Estetica e romanzo* (Turin 1979) 101.

[16] Pseudo-Cyprian, *Ioshua* 357–358: 'Ilicet exsangues crucibus figuntur in altis / Pendentes, donec sese nox reddidit atra.'

[17] Juvencus, 1. 130: 'Exhinc secretis in vallibus abdita semper / vita fuit puero.'

[18] Pseudo-Cyrian, *Exodus* 637: 'Nil praeter undantes ventorum flatibus herbas.'

eliminated). These phenomena are labelled as *Romanisierung* and *Entju-daisierung*, romanization and de-judaization.

In 1999,[19] I proposed analogous observations about the process of legal romanization in the description by the biblical poets of the union and unity of the first couple, the elegiac *descriptio puellae* of Eva, and the interpretation of the episode of Adam's rib through the use of elements of the Narcissus legend as a mirroring motive.

The necessity of cultural interaction also exerts a structural influence on compositional technique, on imitative processes and on the topical repertoire, and it is necessary to have a fuller understanding of these influences in order to reach a fuller comprehension of the texts and, more generally, of the mechanisms at work in every attempt to translate one culture into the language of another. This process is visible on two levels: the first has been dubbed 'innerchristliche Traditionsbildung' by German scholars, and comes into being by the 'sekundäre Imitation innerhalb der christlichen Spätantike'.[20] Until now, this phenomenon has still received little scholarly attention because of the prevalent interest in classical sources. It remains, however, at the base of the mechanics of allusion in a secondary or tertiary tradition such as the Latin-Christian.

A prime example is found in an extrait from the poem *De laudibus Dei* by Dracontius, 'the much underrated poet' who 'emerges as an impressively creative writer' to be 'the most talented poet in fifth-century Africa'.[21] The poem praises God's greatness first by the account of Genesis and incarnation, then linking toghether stories of biblical and Roman legends as moral examples. Line 2. 24 *imperii per saecla tui sine fine manentis* is at first glance an obvious borrowing from Vergil *Aeneid* 1. 270 *imperium sine fine dedi*. However, we must realize firstly that, as Servius *ad Aeneidem* 6. 847 tells, this constitutes already a *locus rhetoricus* in the pagan school, and secondly, that a long-standing tradition exists of patristic citations of the verse and of poetic *Kontrastimitationen* that effectively transfer the empire to Christ: Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum* 1. 542: *Christus* […] *imperium sine fine docet* and Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 2. 55: *imperium sine fine manet*. The *manentis* of Dracontius's verse demonstrates that the model here is not Vergil but Sedulius. In Dracontius' poem the term assumes various connotations of theological twists and

---

[19] Stella F., *La poesia biblica* (note 14) 28–32.

[20] Herzog R., *Bibelepik* (note 9) 207 n. 177.

[21] Bright D.F., *The Miniature Epic in Vandal Africa* (Norman–London 1987) IX.

turns, because the lexeme *manere* refers to a series of poetic formulations of eternity upon which Dracontius makes subtle and refined variations, in relation to the Augustinian treatment of the theme. However, it is important to notice that the intertextual relationship is located and hinged between the two Christian poets, while the Vergilian model is at the head of this chain, as a sort of primordial archetype.

The second level is the imposition and use of a functional hierarchy among biblical and classical influences. The former being the true motive behind the act of writing, they are ranked first, while the latter are placed in a secondary position as *parole*, as repertoire of elements required for the formation of a new code. Line 610 of Dracontius' second book: *Christus enim datus est nobis spes una salutis* is considered a re-use of Lucan 2. 113 *Spes una salutis / oscula pollutae fixisse trementia dextrae* and 5. 636 *Spes una salutis / quod tanta mundi nondum periere ruina*,[22] itself later taken by Silius *Punica* 15. 402: *ducibus spes una salutis, / si socias iungant vires*. The existing commentaries on *De laudibus Dei*, particularly that of Moussy-Camus in the edition of Les Belles Lettres (1985), stops at this point, in the tradition of the best 'Quellenforschung', taking into account that Dracontius demonstrates an astounding grasp of the classical and post-classical epic. I believe rather that to evaluate even a simple expression of this late periods we should fan out the different converging and intersecting inspirations, and search in the realm of biblical culture and the Christian tradition. We can thus detect with relative certainty that the original subtext is the verse in *Isaiah* 9. 6 which in fact announces the arrival of the Son of God as salvation: *parvulus enim natus est nobis, filius datus est nobis*, a text interpreted christologically in the exegesis as well as in liturgy.[23] Other Christian texts could be invoked as co-texts of the biblical revival (*Acts* 27. 20 *spes omnis salutis nostrae*), and the syntagm returns twice in Commodianus, the wild bard of Christian Africa (*Apologeticum* or *Carmen de duobus populis* 303 and 310), in which it refers to the hope in eternal life. But in Christian poetry there is a wide range of cases with *spes* and *salus* as references to God or Christ.[24] Thus the choice depends on the context; in this case the hymnal extrait is replete with Christian references:

---

[22] Perhaps preceded by *Ciris* 295 (apostrophe to Britomartis).

[23] *Messale Romano* (Torino–Roma 1933) 175: *Introitus* to the third Christmas Mass.

[24] Stella F., "Per una teoria dell'imitazione poetica cristiana: saggio di analisi sulle *Laudes Dei* di Draconzio", *Invigilata Lucernis* 7–8 (1985–1986) 193–224, esp. 215–216.

the convergence with Lucan therefore constitutes a revival of an epic utterance already invested, both in its singular elements and in its complex semantics, with Christian valences. It seems to me that we can no longer speak of *interpretatio christiana* of the classics, but of Christian terms in a juncture that connects them in a manner both effective and legitimized by tradition.

An exemplary case of the incongruity which this composite model could create offers Dracontius at 3. 626: *Eripe me his, invicte, malis in corpore sanum*, where the conflation of the famous call of Palinurus (*Aeneid* 6. 365) and the likewise proverbial hemistich of Juvenal 10. 356 must be considered against the background of an entire series of re-workings of Vergilian verse already attempted by Christian poetry: first of all by Proba, who in her Vergilian cento authorizes Christian use of the formula (515: *Eripe me his, inuicte, malis. Quid denique restat, / Quidue sequens tantos possim superare labores?*), and later by Cyprian, *Genesis* 1032: *Eripe me his, inuicte, malis et specula fratris / Infracto placidus quam primum decute ferro*, where it is spoken by Jacob (*Genesis* 32. 11). The patristic history of this expression was already partially reconstructed by Courcelle,[25] and is largely founded on the frequency of psalmic incipits with *eripe me*.[26] One might thus rightly wonder if the process cannot be exactly the opposite of what has been hypothesized: in a context of prayer, replete with psalmic echoes, the appeal *eripe me* activated the memory of the Vergilian verse, which itself bears a Christian depth, even in patristic prose. What remains to be noted is the fact that the Vergilian revival drags with it the semblance of a certain contextual impropriety: the use of the adjective *invicte*. The epithet is not only alien to Dracontian usage, although it belongs to biblical usage,[27] but the passage does not even justify a military metaphor because Dracontius is referring to a helping, peaceful God, *boethós*, not to a God victorious over his enemies. Yet, when thinking of the Vergilian context, it is possible to identify a certain relevance: in the *Aeneid*, *invictus* signifies 'invincible for the will of the fate', referring to Aeneas, and therefore disposed to help those in disgrace who implore pity. As such, we would be facing not an integrative allusion, but rather a reflexive one, keeping with Conte's termi-

---

[25] Courcelle P., "Les pères de l'Eglise devant les enfers virgiliens", *Archives d'histoire doctinale et litéraire du moyen âge* 30 (1955) 18 n. 2.

[26] Psalms 30. 16; 58. 2 sg.; 68. 15 and 19; 70. 2 and 4; 118. 153 and 170; 139. 2; 142. 9; 143. 7.

[27] *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* VII, 2, 187, 65 sg., for example *Sirach* 18. 1: 'Deus solus iustificabitur et manet invictus rex in aeternum.'

nology. A similar allusion presupposes an informed reading minded to identify the resonances and justifications of the intertext. I think that in Christian poetry this form of allusion is active only in polemical contexts, i.e. only—to employ Thraede's terminology—as a *Kontrastimitation*. In this case Dracontius simply allowed himself to be lead along by the usual mechanism of reuse of Christian terms in accordance with traditional epic models, and *invicte* can be defined as an intertextual remnant, a category which Herzog dubbed 'surplus'. Obviously this excess exerts a retroaction upon the image of God, which emerges from the verses of Dracontius: an image that consequently appears the more garishly military and warlike, the less the context requires it. In my opinion, this incongruity is influenced by the fact that the prayer to the liberator God in this poem is a macrometaphor of the prayer to the Vandal king, imploring him to free the poet from his imprisonment. But here I am venturing too far astray into the field of psycho-philology, and even in the katabasis one should not exceed certain limits.

This creative disconnection triggered by intertextual excesses can also be detected in the sphere of intertextual models, for instance that of the poetic topoi. An example of the latter, the most topical topos of epic poetry, would be that of the hundred mouths, the most common metaphorisation of an *affectatio modestiae* studied by Curtius, and one already the subject of detailed analyses by Pascucci, Courcelle, Barchiesi and Hinds:[28] in the field of Christian studies, Klaus Thraede dedicated ponderous essays of a theoretical nature that draw upon a vigorous discourse amongst German scholars, as demonstrated by more than one miscellany devoted to the *Toposforschung*.[29]

---

[28] Courcelle P., "Le cliché virgilien des cent bouches", *Revue des Études Latines* 33 (1955) 231–240; Pascucci G., "Ennio, Ann. 561–562 V. e un tipico procedimento di auxesis nella poesia latina", *Scritti scelti II* (Florence 1983) 575–597 (original ed. 1959); Barchiesi A., "Cento bocche: narratività e valutazione nello studio dell'epica romana", *Reges et proelia. Orizzonti e atteggiamenti dell'epica antica, Pavia 17 marzo 1994* (Como 1994) 45–71; Hinds S., *Allusion and intertext. Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry* (Cambridge 1998) 34–47. Excellent development in Edmunds L., *Intertextuality and the reading of Roman poetry* (Baltimore 2001). The method of 'Quellenforschung' is still dominating in the contributions to the volume by M. Salvadore (ed.), *La poesia tardoantica e medievale. Atti del I convegno internazionale di studi, Macerata 4–5 maggio 1998* (Alessandria 2001).

[29] Thraede K., "Untersuchungen zur Ursprung und zur Geschichte der christlichen Poesie", *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 4 (1961) 108–127; 5 (1962) 125–157; 6 (1963) 101–111; and on the general topic: Pöggeler O., "Dichtungstheorie und Toposforschung", in M. Bäumer (ed.), *Toposforschung* (Darmstadt 1973) 22–135, and Veit W., "Toposforschung. Ein Forschungsbericht", in M. Bäumer (ed.), *Toposforschung* (Darmstadt 1973) 136–210.

In the third book of his *De laudibus Dei*, Dracontius justifies his own inadequacies to praise God with what Wolfgang Kirsch has dubbed a 'geniale Idee':[30] to appeal not to subjective incapacity, but rather to the objective impossibility, the linguistic incompatibility between God and the systems of rhetorical encomium (*laus*, in its rhetorically restricted sense) too closely tied to the contemporary dynamics to be able to face the eternal being. But the cliché of the hundred mouths does not appear in the passage under consideration. It surfaces elsewhere in the third book, in a *confessio* occupying a large part of it. In the lines 565–591 the poet writes:

> We are criminals, we do not deserve generosity,
> And I am the first to be considered more than a sinner.
> In fact, when will I confess every crime, along with
> the heart and the flesh? *Not even if I had a voice of iron*
> *or a great many mouths, as many as the gleaming white teeth of bone, arose in me*
> *or I possesssed as many tongues as hairs I combed on my head*
> *I will succeed in exhausting the number of crimes without deceit.*
> *It will be enough to admit being guilty of every offence.*
> That which your commandments forbid, I alone will admit to committing,
> I will not deny having done all that which horrifies you.
> What good does it do to hide the crimes perpetrated from anyone,
> if the one and only god is both judge and witness ?
> I would be sacrilegious to believe that God does not know all
> or that I can hide anything from Him, and that I can deceive Him in my mind
> withholding something, meanwhile—if a sincere confession reveals the acts committed,
> the hoped for pardon will follow.
> Whoever denies, has already denied themselves pardon.
> So I confess with a guilt and pitiful soul,
> full grave evil, committing more than only one crime;
> *because the number of my crimes is greater than the grains*
> *of sand on the shore and my evils outnumber the sea's waves.*
> I cannot believe that Noah's flood could have punished more crimes
> than those which now weigh upon me.
> The rivers of crime and the storms hit and toss me
> and the seething wave of sins has covered me;

---

[30] Stella F., "Fra retorica e innografia: sul genere letterario delle 'Laudes Dei' di Draconzio", *Philologus* 132 (1988) 213–245.

the water's flows submerge me with surges of guilt and blame
until the wave has reached my soul, grave watery horror.[31]

Only a few decades earlier, Sedulius in his *Carmen Paschale* had given his
own version of the topos (1. 99–102):

The ancestor's ancient belief and the venerable
forefathers' original witness is proved, and in no epoch should they be
    abolished:
through time the signs of your power remain firm and strong.
To my strength I barely trust the task of briefly recounting them
with audacious display of exposition, and entering the extensive wood
I just try to touch a few branches.
Because even if one hundred voices should open and roar with iron voices
and a hundred sounds may emanate from the human breast
this would exhaust all the deeds which even the parched sand
cannot number nor the bright stars of the heavens either?[32]

We will not analyze these two passages in detail. I would merely point
out the alien element that in both modifies not only the choice of
imagery but also the very structure of the cliché. An important inno-
vation is the introduction of the image of innumerability: in the pre-
ceding history of the topos the concept of number, the 'ground' of the
metaphor upon which the argument is based, is implicit in the var-

---

[31] Dracontius, *De laudibus Dei* 3. 565–591: (565) 'Gens scelerata sumus, nil de pietate
merentes, / Quorum primus ego plus quam peccator habendus. / Quando fatebor enim
scelerum simul omne, reatum / Pectoris et carnis? *Non si mihi ferrea uox sit, / Ora tot exsur-*
gant quot dentes ossibus albent / (570) Aut mihi sint linguae quantos caput omne capillos / Pectinat,
explebo numerum sine fraude fidelem, / Sed satis est dixisse reum sub crimine cuncto; / Quod tua
iussa uetant, solus peccasse fatebor, / Omne quod horrescis non me fecisse negabo. /
(575) Quid prodest cuicumque nefas celare peractum, / Cum iudex et testis ades Deus
unus et idem? / Sacrilega quasi mente putem non omnia nosse / Aut aliquid nescire
Deum, cui fraude nocebit / Mens mea quod reticet, cum, si confessio simplex / (580)
Indicet admissum, uenia sperata sequetur. / Qui negat, ipse sibi ueniam iam sponte
negauit. / Ergo ego confiteor miseranda mente reatum / Plenum, grande malum, non
uno crimine partum; / *Nam scelus omne meum numeros superabit harenae* / (585) *Littoris et*
pelagi uincent mala nostra liquores. / Non puto diluuium tantos punisse reatus / Quantos
ipse gero culparum pondere pressus. / Flumina me scelerum rapiunt quatiuntque pro-
cellae / Et peccatorum torrens simul obruit unda; / (590) Me delictorum merserunt
fluctibus amnes, / Vsque animam uenit unda meam, grauis horror aquarum.'

[32] Sedulius, *Carmen Paschalis* 1. 99–102: 'Indicio est antiqua fides et cana priorum /
Testis origo patrum, nullisque abolenda per aeuum / (95) Temporibus constant *uirtutum*
signa tuarum. / Ex quibus audaci perstringere pauca relatu / Vix animis committo meis,
siluamque patentem / Ingrediens aliquos nitor contingere ramos. / *Nam centum licet ora*
mouens uox ferrea clamet / (100) Centenosque sonos humanum pectus anhelet, / Cuncta
quis expediet, quorum nec *lucida caeli / Sidera nec bibulae numeris aequantur harenae*?'

ious *omnia* or *cuncta* or *tot* that since Vergil have represented the song's unreachable objective. The Christians render it explicit first by naming it (*numeris* in v. 102 of Sedulius, *numeros* in v. 584 of Dracontius), and, secondly, by introducing an image of innumerability: the stars in the sky and the sand in the sea, which in themselves constitute a topical metaphor at least since Catullus 7.[33] This secundary imagery carries with it a biblical valence that in turn impregnates these allusions with rather complex exegetic resonances which we will not examine. It is only in Sedulius that sand and stars came to be associated with the topos of modesty, particularly the version of the hundred mouths, and Dracontius constitutes the second link in a new Christian chain. In Dracontius the impetus to increase, which according to Pascucci establishes one of the rules for the development of this topos, acts differently by multiplying the mouth and tongue metaphors, which are then separated each from another, to become independent metaphors, while still remaining connected. But the anxiety to increase the elements triggers nasty tricks: Dracontius' mouths in fact amount to *quot dentes ossibus albent*, that is—still using Vergil (*Aeneid* 12. 36)—as many as there are teeth. Normally, however, a human mouth has less than one hundred teeth.

Compared to the progressive *auxesis* of Homer's one hundred mouths or the future one thousand of the Carolingian Theodulf, Dracontius' application means a clumsy jump backwards. And as if that weren't enough: the tongues, on the contrary, evidently in a monstrous body in which there is no homology between mouth and tongue, number as many as the combable hairs on one's head. Dracontius is actually the first and only Latin poet to use the verb *pectinare* twice. But it is precisely this innovation, which we could easily attribute to the baroque passion for multiplying metaphors, that actually has a biblical justification and, moreover, can be understood only when we consider the text found in *Psalms* 39. 13, as did Faustino Arevalo, the first Dracontius editor and commentator of the late seventeen hundreds: '[My evils] are more than the hairs of mine head.'[34]

---

[33] McCartney E.S., "Vivid ways of Indicating Incountable Numbers", *Classical Philology* 55 (1960) 79–89.

[34] Translation according to the King James version (= Psalm 40. 12). Psalm 39. 13: 'Multiplicate sunt [iniquitates] super capillos capitis mei' ('iuxta Hebraeos' version: 'plures factae sunt quam capilli capitis mei').

In these verses, Dracontius is actually confessing his own faults and expressing the very impossibility of counting them, and in this way he needs the model of intonation offered by the penitential Psalms, which for centuries provided the model for the prayerful confessio. That the Psalms would be in fact the subtext for the passage is confirmed by the choice of the imagery of innumerability instituted by Sedulius. Whereas Sedulius speaks of sand and stars, Dracontius only mentions sand, and immediately links it to the successive metaphor of waves, also used as an illustration of the innumerability of his faults. In this instance, the metaphoric ground comes once more from Psalm 68: '[…] for the waters are come in unto my soul […] I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me.'[35]

Dracontius goes on and on with the aquatic metaphor, conform to his tendency for prolixity and his predilection for chains of metaphors. And the fact that *mala nostra* is a favored expression of Ovid[36] only confirms the process by which a cultural repertoire (the biblical one) functions as a hierarchically superior arch-text, while the classics function as a formulaic reserve;[37] it is the former that activates the latter.[38] The relation between the two is not always balanced, or to put it more aptly: a semantic compatibility can not always be found between the two codes, and the fissure between these two systems opens the door to the 'betrayal' perpetrated by the Christian epic, to the damage of the biblical system. In the work of the African poet a further mechanism is added to this scheme, one constantly loaded by its very position as hinge between the two cultures: the penchant for extended imagery, for increased articulation and multiple levels such as we tried to study in an

---

[35] Translation according to the King James version (= Psalm 69. 1–2). Psalm 68. 2–3: 'Intraverunt aquae usque ad animam meam […] Veni in altitudinem maris et tempestas demersit me.' Also Psalm 17. 5: 'Torrentes iniquitatis conturbaverunt me'.

[36] In the *Tristia*, in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* and in the *Heroides*.

[37] The example of Dracontius, however violent his intervention in the elastic but fragile topos structure might be, was followed by others: in the Carolingian era Alcuinus of York retook it in a prose letter (39), and in the Ottonian period Heriger of Lobbes (*Vita Ursmari*) imitated it with little variations in order to express the indescribability of Saint Ursmar's merits, including the teeth and the hair to comb.

[38] M. Roberts also observes in *The Jeweled Style. Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca-London 1989) 143, that 'Christian literature may include descriptive passages in the manner of its secular counterparts, but they must be read according to a different code'.

old essay.[39] In many passages this process involves the images' exegetical meaning, their projection into an ulterior dimension—divine or moral, or metaphysical or eschatological.

A poetics of alterity gradually develops which is perpetually shifting within a network of meaning in which each element can refer to another, in a cycle of significations whereby they unendingly dodge the restriction of a unique definition. If it is true, as has been written, that in the classical topos a kind of suspension of the referential discourse is activated,[40] then the Christian poets' need to recover the link with a *new* system of reference gives a new motivation even to the most basic compositional choices. This is the historic moment in which the inertial weight of the topos gets exhausted, and is in turn recharged by completely new mental categories. In practice, this reactivation occurs thanks to the interaction with an entire complex of texts—biblical and patristic—perceived as superior, in terms of both morals and content, to those that transmitted the verbal elements of the topos. These poets construe a structural diphony that would always guarantee a double reading of every single verse: it is the embryo of the *modus allegoricus* which will dominate medieval poetry, and which originates from the necessity to connect different cultural systems and modes of expression apparently incompatible; but also, more trivially, from the necessity to relate stories separated by centuries, such as those of Isaiah and of Christ, of Eve and of Mary.

In his sophisticated monography on the skills of late-antique literature, *The Jeweled Style*, Michael Roberts described certain cases of 'spiritual reading of visual experience' as examples of a specific aspect of the Christian aesthetic. The aesthetical theories of J. Elsner go in the same direction.[41] Yet probably we can go beyond the statement that

---

[39] Stella F., "Ristrutturazione topica ed estensione metaforica nella poesia cristiana. Da spunti draconziani", *Wiener Studien* 102 (1989) 213–245. Many suggestions in this sense are to be found in the masterful Roberts M., *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity* (Liverpool 1985) 157: 'At times the opportunity to incorporate a poetic reminiscence seems to have been the main motive for the expanded syntactical structure'; and 206: 'The details that are chosen for ecphrastic amplification from the biblical text are those which evoke reminiscences of pagane epic or lend themselves readily to the mannered treatment favoured by contemporary taste.' Further steps in this direction are taken by Malsbary G., "Epic Exegesis and the Use of Vergil in the Early Biblical Poets", *Florilegium* 7 (1985) 53–83.

[40] Barchiesi A., *Cento bocche* (note 28) 48.

[41] Elsner J., "Late Antique Art: the Problem of the Concept and the Cumulative

'Christian piety and secular literary preferences are woven together in a seamless web that manifests that unproblematic assimilation of the two traditions in the poet's own creative imagination.'[42] Jakobson has demonstrated that the *Kreuzung der Gattungen*, the cross of the genres and of the styles, is an illusion on the part of the reader accustomed to certain reading traditions:[43] in each text the elements deriving from different genres are not ordered on the same level, but rather according to hierarchies that designate a new configuration which can not be reduced to the sum of the elements.

We are facing the signs of a rebuilding of the poetic code, which configures a different type of continuity of Latin literature. And if it is worth it, as Jauss proposed, to attempt a poetic history of the invisible from Late Antiquity to Baudelaire, it might be interesting also to reconstruct the dynamics which have been used to express the invisible with the language of the visible.

The fundamental mechanism is obviously the one which was most profoundly defined in medieval times by John Scotus Eriugena and Alanus of Lille, and amply studied by Auerbach and by de Lubac, above and beyond an infinite number of recent studies.[44] The *modus symbolicus* was not adopted as an occasional and ornamental figure but as a constant structural orientation and perspective. Just as Jauss' intuition theorized a poetic history of the invisible, we are not far, from the point of view of mental categories, from the type of perception of nature and of spiritual life which will be reintroduced by Baudelaire in the poetry of the nineteenth century, and which today, with technical terms which are different from those of allegory but substantially faithful to them, could be defined as 'the assumption of alterity in the same poetry's genesis',

---

Aesthetic", in S. Swain – M. Edwards (eds.), *Approaching Late Antiquity. The Transformation from Early to Late Empire* (Oxford 2004) 271–304.

[42] Roberts M., *The Jeweled Style* (note 38) 147.

[43] The usual notion of *mélange des genres* is still familiar to Deproost P.-A., "L'épopée biblique en langue latine. Essai de définition d'un genre littéraire", *Latomus* 56 (1997) 15–39; see Pollmann K., "Das lateinische Epos in der Spätantike", in J. Rüpke (ed.), *Von Göttern und Menschen erzählen. Formkonstanzen und Funktionswandeln vormoderner Epik* (Stuttgart 2001) 93–129. Sound critics to this notion by Barchiesi A., *The Crossing*, in S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Texts, Ideas and the Classics* (Oxford 2001) 142–163.

[44] A survey in Stella F., *Poesia e teologia. L'Occidente latino tra IV e VIII secolo* (Milano 2001), esp. the Introduction, and Dawson J.D., *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (Berkeley 2002).

a visual or polyphonic dialogue based on the permanent multiplicity of
every narrative line, every meaning, every significance.[45]

To the *allegoria in verbis* which is possible in all poetry, the *allegoria in
factis* in biblical poetry can be added, which derives from the Christian
Bible's historical dimension, not only working in the correspondence of

---

[45] A remarkable example can be found in the *Actus Apostolorum* by Arator: the
encounter between Peter and Simon the Magician, which finishes with a diatribe
against this figure, who claims that he can buy the spiritual skills. An example: I 643–
671 Arator announces his resort to the allegory: 'Haec de voce sacrae lux est ma-
nifesta figurae', and starts recounting, as a "cameo" inside the main plot, the story
of Noah's ark, typus of the Church ('Ecclesiae speciem praestabat machina quon-
dam / temporibus constructa Noe, quae sola recepit / omne genus clausisque ferens
baptismatis instar'): an explanation which apparently was neither necessary to the econ-
omy of the primary narration nor to the economy of the subsequent simile; therefore
bombastic, alienating, poetic. From the ark break away the dove and the raven: the lat-
ter, as predator, is not satisfied and comes back without good results; the former, more
unselfish, comes back with the olive branch, example of the love which bears always
fruits of love and peace (secundary allegory). Both are flying over the flows: the exam-
ple demonstrates that without the individual endowments baptism is not sufficient (sec-
ondary tropology): 'non ergo saluti / sufficit unda lavans nisi sit sine felle columba / qui
generatur aquis'). The same happens to Simon the Magician: in this figure, compared
to the raven, the spiral of the symbologies finds its semiotic center, its primary referent:
'Simon had touched the wave of the baptism, but it was a raven which is looking for
his gain and can not buy God, who throws the salesmen out of the temple': 'Simon hic
baptismatis undam / contingerat, sed corvus erat sua lucra requirens, / quae numquam
meruere Deum, qui limine templi / vendentes arcere solet'. Peter, on the contrary, is the
dove: 'Peter […] is called son of the dove by the voice of God, and rightly created by
this mother, puts up the work of the Church; by the gift of the offspring he receives the
name of the mother—elected by the Holy Ghost which deigned to present itself in the
image of an innocent bird': 'Petrus ad ista vocat, qui filius esse columbae / dicitur ore
Dei meritoque hac matre creatus / ecclesiae sublimat opus; de munere prolis / nomen
habet genetrix, quod Spiritus eligit almus, / alitis innocuae dignatus imagine cerni'.
Here the spiral folds up: Peter is an example of love which bears peace, like the dove,
but like the dove he is also the apex of the activity of the Church (in the twofold mean-
ing that Peter—the pope—is at the summit of the Church and that supreme love is the
summit of the Church).

   In this example the fusion of the hermeneutic and poetic strategies—what has been
called (Angelucci) 'the emotion of the interdimensional passage'—becomes perfect,
and directs to a textual meaning every single, aesthetically autonomous tessera, which
seemed to accumulate for intellectual affectation. The typological dimension of the
story merges with the allegorical one (for the moral aspect) and the sacramental one
(for the Church) and togheter with both spins a semiotic triangle which reaches its peak
in the final coincidence of the references. In Arator the repertory of the figurants of the
Holy Scripture becomes a code of the imaginary, where, for the first time in poetical
history, the significants become at the same moment the bearers of significance (the
signifiant works simultaneously as the *signifié*), in a fusion of contexts inconceivable in
other cultural situations, and rarely mastered to such a degree even in medieval times.

the two Testaments but also in its many historical interpretations. For this literature, therefore, the exegesis represents something more than what simile represented in classical poetry: the transition to another dimension of the reality, the correlation with a different code of meaning. In fact, it introduces the perception of a *permanent* co-presence of the alterity in the script, of a plurality of aspects and senses.

The communicative situation is also different: the 'bi-univocity' of the habitual communicative rapport between author and addressee in Christian poetry is replaced by a type of *semiotic triangulation* between author, God, and public, of which a theologian could audaciously make an analogy with the circular communication between the three personages of the Holy Trinity. God acts as the permanent addressee, as is seen in a hymn or in confession, and yet he functions at the same time as co-author, or main author, or source of inspiration, and, simultaneously, he is the object of the narration, as in biblical poetry, or in the varieties of its theological extensions.

The triangle of Christian communication can be translated on a poetic level as a triangle of codes of meaning: on the one hand the biblical source, on another the repertory of classical poetry, and in third place—in relationship with the other two poles but with its own autonomy—the tradition of Christian poetry, the first ring of mediation between the other two aspects, composed of *centones*, of Juvencus' *Evangeliorum libri*, and subsequently of the authors who became part of this canon-in-progress.

Select Bibliography

ALTER R – Kermode F., *The Literary Guide to the Bible* (Cambridge 1987)

ALTER R., *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York 1981)

BAKHTIN M., *Estetica e romanzo*, It. trans. C. Strada Janovič (Torino 1979)

BARCHIESI A., "Cento bocche: narratività e valutazione nello studio dell'epica romana", *Reges et proelia. Orizzonti e atteggiamenti dell'epica antica, Pavia 17 marzo 1994* (Como 1994) 45–71

——, *The Crossing*, in S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Texts, Ideas and the Classics* (Oxford 2001) 142–163

BAST R.J. – Gow A.C. (eds.), *Continuity and Change: the harvest of late medieval and Reformation history: essays presented to Heiko A. Oberman on his 70th birthday* (Leiden–Boston 2000)

BLUMENBERG H., *Die Legitimität der Neuzeit* (Frankfurt / Main 1966)

BRAGUE, R., *Il futuro dell'Occidente. Nel modello romano la salvezza dell'Europa*, It. trans. A. Soldati – A.M. Lorusso (Milano 2005)

BRANHAM R.B. (ed.), *Bakhtin and the Classics* (Evanston, Il. 2002)

BRIGHT David F., *The Miniature Epic in Vandal Africa* (Norman–London 1987)

CAMERON A., *Continuity and change in sixth-century Byzantium* (reprint: London 1981)

CESERANI R., *Brevi appunti sulla riscoperta della Bibbia come grande testo letterario*, in F. Stella (ed.), *La Scrittura infinita. Bibbia e poesia in età romantica e contemporanea* (Florence 1999) 19–38

COURCELLE P., "Le cliché virgilien des cent bouches", *Revue des Études Latines* 33 (1955) 231–240

——, "Les pères de l'Eglise devant les enfers virgiliens", *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 30 (1955) 5–74

DAWSON J.D., *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (Berkeley 2002)

DEPROOST P.-A., "L'épopée biblique en langue latine. Essai de définition d'un genre littéraire", *Latomus* 56 (1997) 15–39

EDMUNDS L., *Intertextuality and the reading of Roman poetry* (Baltimore 2001)

ELSNER J., "Late Antique Art: the Problem of the Concept and the Cumulative Aesthetic", in S. Swain – M. Edwards (eds.), *Approaching Late Antiquity. The Transformation from Early to Late Empire* (Oxford 2004) 271–304

HAGENDAHL H., "Methods of citation in postclassical Latin", *Eranos* 45 (1947) 114–128

HERZOG R., *Die Bibelepik der lateinischen Spätantike. Geschichte einer erbaulichen Gattung* (Munich 1975)

HERZOG R. – KOSELLECK R. (eds.), *Epochenschwelle und Epochenbewusstsein* (Munich 1987)

HINDS S., *Allusion and intertext. Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry* (Cambridge 1998)

HÖLSCHER U., *Die Odyssee. Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman* (Munich 1988)

HUBINGER P.E., *Zur Frage der Periodengrenze zwischen Altertum und Mitelalter* (Darmstadt 1969)

HUBINGER P.E. (ed.), *Kulturbruch oder Kulturkontinuität im Übergang von der Antike zum Mittelalter* (Darmstadt 1968)

JAUSS H.R., *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft* (Konstanz 1967) It. trans. A. Vàrvaro, *Perché la storia della letteratura?* (Naples 1970)

LANGREITER N. (ed.), *Kontinuität-Wandel: kulturwissenschaftliche Versuche über ein schwieriges Verhältnis* (Wien 2002)

LUHMANN N., *Das Problem der Epochenbildung und die Evolutionstheorie* in H.U. Gumbert – U. Link-Heer (eds.), *Epochenschwellen und Epochenstrukturen im Diskurs der Literatur- und Sprachtheorie* (Frankfurt / Main 1985) 11–33

MALSBARY G., "Epic Exegesis and the Use of Vergil in the Early Biblical Poets", *Florilegium* 7 (1985) 53–83

MCCARTNEY E.S., "Vivid ways of Indicating Incountable Numbers", *Classical Philology* 55 (1960) 79–89

MÜLLER S., *Paradigmenwechsel und Epochenwandel—Zur Struktur wissenschaftshistorischer und geschichtlicher Mobilität bei Thomas S. Kuhn, Hans Blumenberg und Hans Freyer*, *Saeculum* 32 (1981) 1–30

PASCUCCI G., "Ennio, Ann. 561–562 V. e un tipico procedimento di auxesis

nella poesia latina", in *Scritti scelti II* (Florence 1983) 575–597 (original ed. 1959)

Petrikovits H. von, *Der diachorische Aspekt der Kontinuität von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter*, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse (Göttingen 1982)

Pöggeler O., "Dichtungstheorie und Toposforschung", in M. Bäumer (ed.), *Toposforschung* (Darmstadt 1973) 22–135

Pollmann K., "Das lateinische Epos in der Spätantike", in J. Rüpke (ed.), *Von Göttern und Menschen erzählen. Formkonstanzen und Funktionswandeln vormoderner Epik*, (Stuttgart 2001) 93–129

Roberts M., *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity* (Liverpool 1985)

———, *The Jeweled Style. Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca-London 1989)

Salvadore M. (ed.), *La poesia tardoantica e medievale. Atti del I convegno internazionale di studi, Macerata 4–5 maggio 1998* (Alessandria 2001)

Schmid W, "Tityrus christianus", *Rheinisches Museum* 96 (1953), reprinted in K. Gamber (ed.), *Europäische Bukolik und Georgik* (Darmstadt 1976) 44–121

Stella F. (ed.), *La Scrittura infinita: bibbia e poesia in età medievale e umanistica* (Florence 2001)

Stella F., "Fra retorica e innografia: sul genere letterario delle 'Laudes Dei' di Draconzio", *Philologus* 132 (1988) 213–245

———, "La poesia biblica come problema interculturale: saggi sulle creazioni di Eva", *Semicerchio. Rivista di poesia comparata* 20–21 (1999) 28–32

———, "Per una teoria dell'imitazione poetica cristiana: saggio di analisi sulle *Laudes Dei* di Draconzio", *Invigilata Lucernis* 7–8 (1985–1986) 193–224

———, "Ristrutturazione topica ed estensione metaforica nella poesia cristiana. Da spunti draconziani", *Wiener Studien* 102 (1989) 213–245

———, *Ad supplementum sensus. Pluralità ermeneutica e incremento di senso nella poetica biblica dal Medioevo a Derrida. Le ragioni di un convegno*, in F. Stella (ed.), *La Scrittura infinita. Bibbia e poesia in età romantica e contemporanea* (Florence 1999) 1–17

———, *Antichità Europee* in A. Gnisci (ed.), *Letteratura comparata* (Milano 2002) 31–61, Spanish version in *Introducción a la literatura comparada* (Barcelona 2002) 71–127

———, *Eteroglossia del testo e comparazione interculturale*, in *Interculturalità Antropologia Religioni Letteratura*, special issue of *Testimonianze* 384–385 (1995) 99–122, reprinted in *Semicerchio. Rivista di poesia comparata* 14 (1996) 2–14

———, *Poesia e teologia. L'Occidente latino tra IV e VIII secolo* (Milano 2001)

Thraede K., "Untersuchungen zur Ursprung und zur Geschichte der christlichen Poesie", *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 4 (1961) 108–127; 5 (1962) 125–157; 6 (1963) 101–111

———, "Epos", *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* V (1960) 1034–1041

Trümpy H. (ed.), *Kontinuität—Diskontinuität in der Geisteswissenschaft* (Darmstadt 1973)

Veit W., "Toposforschung. Ein Forschungsbericht", in M. Bäumer (ed.), *Toposforschung* (Darmstadt 1973) 136–210

Vogt-Spira G. – Rommel B. (eds.), *Rezeption und Identität: die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma* (Stuttgart 1999)

WENDORFF R., *Zeit und Kultur. Geschichte der Zeitbewusstseins in Europa* (Opladen 1980²)

WEST M., *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford 1997)

LINGUISTIC UNITY AND VARIETY OF STYLES: THE LATIN OF POGGIO BRACCIOLINI

Davide Canfora

The works of Poggio Bracciolini provide a striking example of complex, articulate writing in Latin in the humanist age, and of that variety of styles which Silvia Rizzo—in a recent paper—neatly described as 'the Latin languages of the humanists'.[1] Such diversity of style was not exclusive to Poggio. In fact, it may be said that most fifteenth century authors were able to use more than one Latin register and thus demonstrated *in corpore viri*—if we may borrow the expression—the vitality, which they themselves championed, of the language of ancient Rome. One interesting and famous example of variety is provided by Pico della Mirandola: in his *Oratio de hominis dignitate*, which was to become one of the defining works of humanist culture, he openly imitated classical Latin. In his *Conclusiones*, on the other hand, a work in which his mode of reasoning is also closer to that of medieval usage, he used Parisian Latin, the language of the philosophy scholars.

Like most of the first generation of humanists, Poggio was involved in the attempt to revive ancient Latin as a living language. Its most famous fifteenth century instance was Lorenzo Valla's *Elegantiae*. The epic tone of its foreword, in particular, is perhaps the best example of humanist *imitatio* of the classical world—imitation that was not, of course, limited to language. Valla in particular transposed the idea of Roman supremacy to the fields of culture and, as we have seen, of language. It is well-known that he liked to portray himself as a new Camillus, aiming at fighting off barbarian invaders.[2] It should be pointed out that this revision of the concept of *imitatio* was only apparently inspired by enlightened tolerance: the loss of political and

---

[1] Rizzo S., "I latini dell'Umanesimo", in G. Bernardi Perini (ed.), *Il Latino nell'età dell'Umanesimo. Atti del Convegno (Mantova, 26–27 ottobre 2001)* (Florence 2004) 51–95.

[2] Regoliosi M., *Nel cantiere del Valla. Elaborazione e montaggio delle "Elegantie"* (Rome 1993) 119–125.

military hegemony which occurred in ancient Rome is replaced by Valla with a theory of permanent cultural superiority which in Italy had ancient roots. To stray for a moment outside the humanist age, one is reminded of Petrarch's *Contra eum qui maledixit Italiae*: in this work, in words which today might raise a smile, Petrarch spoke of the Cola di Rienzo affair as a moment in history when the whole of Europe trembled at the thought that Rome might recover its ancient power and conquer the world once again.

For Poggio too, the idea of classical revival was not restricted to language. This is evident from his epigraphic research, an aspect of ancient culture in which Poggio cultivated an interest which led him to personally scouring the countryside around Rome for inscriptions. It is evident too, of course, from his passion for palaeography, a subject on which Albinia de la Mare has written incomparably.[3] As far as his palaeographic interests are concerned, Poggio was so blinded by his love of the ancients that he even maintained—as is well-known— that the writing he himself found in manuscripts and named *littera antiqua* dated back to the classical era, whereas it was actually from the Carolingian period.

The attempt to revive the Latin language took shape primarily in Poggio's dialogues. The serious tone of his ethical-moral writing was implicitly but obviously modelled on Cicero's Latin. These were the years when the humanists were only just beginning to enter into the ideological debate on the principle of imitation which would assume enormous importance in the second half of the fifteenth century (Poliziano, Cortesi) and at the height of the Renaissance. Vincenzo Fera has recently written an accurate reconstruction of the history of humanist Ciceronianism—which is, above all, the history of the principle of imitation—from the time of Petrarch up to the end of the fourteen hundreds.[4]

Poggio's Ciceronianism in the dialogues was in any case empirical. It must be emphasised here that the imitation of models in the first part of the fifteenth century had political as well as linguistic significance, not to mention a by no means irrelevant connection with the ideology of so-called 'civic' humanism.[5] For Petrarch, Cicero was the noblest

---

[3] Mare A.C. de la, *The Handwriting of Italian Humanists* (Oxford 1973).

[4] Fera V., "L'*imitatio* umanistica", in G. Bernardi Perini (ed.), *Il Latino nell'età dell' Umanesimo. Atti del Convegno (Mantova, 26–27 ottobre 2001)* (Florence 2004) 17–33.

[5] On 'civic' humanism, see Garin E., *L'Umanesimo italiano. Filosofia e vita civile nel*

model of active life. Bruni saw the Roman orator as the model of the perfect citizen, who put his own cultural gifts at the service of the *civitas*, exactly as Dante would do. So Poggio was influenced—although not exclusively—by Cicero's dialogue form. He was after all fully involved in the 'civic' humanism movement, to the extent that he was able to write extremely knowledgeably of its period of crisis and decline. It should also be pointed out here, however—and I will return to this point later—that the strength of the Ciceronian model (which in some of Poggio's dialogues led to an authentic *in utramque partem* discussion) did not always necessarily extend to respect for the rules of classical grammar. Let us consider the transmission of the text of the *De vera nobilitate*. In an ironic comment on the nobility of the knights, Poggio states:

> Although we see some of them gain profit by trade, remaining as far removed from the lustre of nobility as they come close to the obscurity of the army.[6]

The transmission of the *De vera nobilitate*, it should be noted, appears to rely on two main lines: on the one hand, there is the Laurentian codex *Plut. 47.19*—which, although not in Poggio's own hand, was written under his direct supervision—and seven of its descendants; on the other hand, a vast array of manuscripts, which we will call *beta*, comprising about forty copies.

Now in the case of the variants *remotos* and *propinquos* there are historical anomalies. In fact not only the *beta* codexes, but also the descendants of the Laurentian codex, read *remoti* and *propinqui*, a syntactical error: *remotos* and *propinquos* actually refer to *aliquos* and thus have to be accusative plural. The Bodleian Library codex *Canon. Misc. 577*, a descendant of the Laurentian, is in this case an exception: it reads *remoti mala grammatica* and *propinqui*. The Laurentian reads (correctly) *remotos* and *propinquos*.

Rinascimento (Bari 1952); Baron H., *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance. Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton 1966[2]); Skinner Q., *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought: the Renaissance* (Cambridge 1978); Pastore Stocchi M., "Il pensiero politico degli umanisti", in L. Firpo (ed.), *Storia delle idee politiche economiche e sociali III* (Turin 1987) 3–63; J. Hankins (ed.), *Renaissance Civic Humanism. Reappraisals and Reflections* (Cambridge 2000).

[6] Bracciolini Poggio, *De vera nobilitate*, ed. D. Canfora (Rome 2002) 17: 'Quamquam videmus aliquos ex eis mercatura questum facere, tantum ab nobilitatis splendore remotos quantum obscuritati exercitii propinquos.'

The Laurentian is, moreover, a highly unusual case. It reads *remoti* and *propinqui* but there is a subsequent correction written faintly in pen (probably by Poggio) to *remotos* and *propinquos*. The Laurentian was a "home-made" fair copy of the original, which Poggio had made by one of his regular copyists. However, *remoti* and *propinqui* are not to be considered errors on the part of this copyist: the fact that the same variant appears in the *beta* codexes (which are independent of the Laurentian) allows us to assert that the error is in the original.

There is another important point regarding the Oxford codex. This can be traced back to the Laurentian text as it was *before* being emended, as can be seen from the fact that it reads *remoti mala grammatica* and *propinqui*. The note *mala grammatica* was inserted into the text itself by the copyist, who does not seem to have understood that it was actually a gloss. In the model, the gloss was almost certainly not part of the text itself, but written between lines or in the margin, and it was intended to point out precisely that glaring grammatical mistake spotted by a reader of *De vera nobilitate*.

The copyist of the Oxford codex is unknown: the codex contains Veronese decorations and can be dated to the 1460's. It may therefore be conjectured that the copyist of the Oxford codex was able to use an 'important' copy of *De vera nobilitate*: I would not rule out the possibility that it was actually the personal copy of Guarino di Verona (1370–1460). He was not on good terms with Poggio and might perhaps have been glad of the opportunity to point out a mistake in the latter's Latin. So it is possible that Guarino was behind the mischievous note *mala grammatica*.

Whatever the truth of the matter, the fact remains that the error occurred in the original and at some point Poggio became aware of it. Consequently he corrected the Laurentian. The mistake, it should be noted, was very probably due to the interference of the vernacular with the Latin: in fact, in Italian the accusative plural in apposition does not exist.[7]

---

[7] On Latin and vernacular in the age of Humanism, see Tavoni M., *Latino, grammatica, volgare. Storia di una questione umanistica* (Padova 1984) and Patota G., "Latino e volgare, latino nel volgare", in G. Bernardi Perini (ed.), *Il Latino nell'età dell'Umanesimo. Atti del Convegno (Mantova, 26–27 ottobre 2001)* (Florence 2004) 109–166.

Poggio's imitation of epistolary writing is more decidedly Ciceronian: in this he is even more refined and intelligent than ever. In particular in the private confession to his alter ego Niccolò Niccoli, to whom he explicitly assigned the same role that Cicero assigned to Atticus, Poggio revived the more colloquial tone of Ciceronian Latin and expressed his own increasing unease with contemporary society, just as Cicero had done in his dialogues with Atticus.

'Civic' humanism was in fact in a state of evident decline: Cicero's collection of letters addressed to his great friend in the years of the collapse of the *res publica* was therefore a perfect model. Atticus was the noble Roman who chose to live apart and who right to the end avoided entering into damaging conflict with the powers of the day. Niccoli, in his turn, was as much an advocate of the Epicurean λάθε βιώσας as of Stoic *virtus* and, distancing himself from 'civic' humanism, always maintained a privileged relationship with the new *signori* of Florence, the Medici. He had actually been criticised during the years of the oligarchic republic for being an uncommitted, rather 'useless' intellectual: for example, Bruni's *Oratio in nebulonem maledicum*, which was addressed to Niccoli, accused him of hiding away fruitlessly with his books (Niccoli was in fact a great reader, not a writer), of not playing a useful role in the life of the *civitas*, and even of obscure ancestry (namely, not being part of the oligarchic circle which had lost power to the Medicis in 1434).

It should be added that, being well aware that the Latin which Cicero used in his letters to Atticus was a spoken language, Poggio too expressed himself with studied simplicity, even inserting short vernacular phrases into his Latin letters. One possible example is in epistle 29 of the Harth edition. It dates back to the spring of 1429:

> Si forsan epistola tibi placeret—writes Poggio to his friend—cura ut habeam eius copiam, quia illius transcribende non datur tempus. *Vale, che gli occhi mi…*[8]

The simplicity of the syntactic construction mirrors a colloquial use of the phrase probably influenced by the vernacular. And, actually, in bidding farewell, Poggio passes imperceptibly from the Latin to the vernacular: the phrase is incomplete, but it is easy to guess that he

---

[8] Bracciolini Poggio, *Lettere (I. Lettere a Niccolò Niccoli)*, ed. H. Harth (Florence 1984) 82: 'If my letter might please you, make sure that you will have a copy made of it, because there was no time to transcribe it. Vale, that my eyes are…'

was referring to the deterioration of his eyesight, which from the mid –
1430's prevented him from almost ever writing again in his own hand.

I would like to quote at this point another example from Poggio's
epistles:

> Hic Venetus—Poggio writes to Niccoli in December 1421—de quo tibi
> mentionem feci quotidie me confirmat pollicitis suis, in quo ego nonnihil
> spero. Rogo te maiorem in modum, ut tu et Nicola curam suscipiatis
> pannorum meorum, qui sunt Pisis detisque operam, ut auferantur inde,
> ne putrescant: *che mi costano troppo caro*.[9]

Here too the sentence flows freely and the lexis appears to be influ-
enced by the vernacular. As Mirko Tavoni and Silvia Rizzo have point-
ed out, it is actually always difficult to ascertain how much of the collo-
quial language of the fifteenth century is spoken Latin and how much
is translated vernacular. However, there is no doubt that, as the above
example illustrates, Poggio's reasoning leads him to use an expression
which is undoubtedly influenced by the vernacular. The comic effec-
tiveness of the insertion of phrases in the vernacular is in this case
enhanced by the rather banal subject under discussion (Poggio is speak-
ing of clothes he wishes to get back from someone) and clearly high-
lights the difference, of which the humanists were well aware, between
the only really plausible use of Latin in the modern age (for the dis-
cussion of noble subjects) and its undoubtedly forced use (for the dis-
cussion of everyday problems). It is worthwhile mentioning in pass-
ing that there were serious problems regarding the compatibility of
Latin—which Leon Battista Alberti complained about—with technical
language, when, for example, it was necessary to coin neologisms to
describe recent inventions.

The decision to graft the vernacular onto the Latin of the epistles is
a sure proof of humanist diglossia. Even if it does not allude implicitly
to the *vexata quaestio*—which the humanists were debating so heatedly—
of the Latin spoken by the ancient Romans,[10] it offers at least a tacit

---

[9] Bracciolini Poggio, *Lettere (I. Lettere a Niccolò Niccoli)*, ed. H. Harth (Florence 1984)
33: 'This Venetian fellow, whom I mentioned to you, confirms me daily by his prom-
isses, which give me strong hope. I ask you the more urgently that you will take care,
together with Nicola, of my cloths which are in Pisa and that you look after it that they
will be taken away from that place to prevent them from destruction, because they are
too expensive.'

[10] Rizzo S., "Il latino nell'Umanesimo", in. A. Asor Rosa (ed.), *Letteratura italiana. Le
questioni* (Turin 1986) 379–408; Fubini R., "La coscienza del latino negli umanisti", in
Umanesimo e secolarizzazione da Petrarca a Valla (Rome 1990) 1–75; Tateo F., "Quale latino

acknowledgement of it. Poggio, as we know, did not share Bruni's opinion. The latter, undoubtedly influenced by Dante's *De vulgari eloquentia*, thought that in ancient Rome the artificial Latin of the scholars and the vernacular were separate from each other.

Poggio, on the other hand, in his *Historia convivalis* was more or less of the same opinion as Flavio Biondo, who, having greater historical perspective, defined the "real" state of Latin: one tongue comprising both the cultured language of the great classical authors and the spoken language. No written record of this spoken language survives but it was not to be considered distinct from the written language. In inserting the Italian vernacular for comic purposes into the Latin of the epistles, Poggio is making a joke about this *quaestio* for the Latin of the ancients: the level of popular expressiveness, he seems to be saying, is in modern times provided by the vernacular, which is the present-day equivalent of what in ancient times was the everyday spoken language as distinct from the Latin of Cicero's orations.

Consistent with this basic idea is the scarcity of elegant language which characterizes Poggio's Latin, sometimes even in the more high-flown passages of his writing: this mirrors his use of syntax, which is also not very classical. Valla, as we know, harshly reproved Poggio for his failure to eschew 'barbarisms': the use of the term *aliqualis*, which was in effect a clumsy medieval hand-me-down, seemed to strike the author of the *Elegantiae* as an issue of almost national importance. It is no coincidence, however, that Poggio used *aliqualis* in the colloquial Latin of the epistles and not in the more refined dialogues.

Poggio's flexible, tolerant attitude towards 'barbaric' Latin was certainly not the result of ignorance. It was simply a matter of his being of a different mindset: unlike Valla, Poggio never considered himself a new Camillus bearing arms in defence of authentic Latin. (This, incidentally, did not prevent him from showing himself to be anything but immune to *campanilismo* and from exhibiting astonishment that a Dutch correspondent of his, William of Heze, should prove more expert in the *studia humanitatis* than Poggio considered reasonable to expect of a foreign man of letters).[11] Moreover, Poggio and Valla saw the question in

---

per i moderni?", in G. Cavallo – C. Leonardi – E. Menestò (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo I, La produzione del testo 1* (Rome 1992) 154–164.

[11] About this, see IJsewijn J., "Humanism in the Low Countries", in A. Rabil jr. (ed.), *Renaissance Humanism. Foundations, Forms and Legacy. II: Humanism beyond Italy* (Philadelphia 1988) 161.

different terms: the former's concept of language was as a living organism in a state of evolution, while the latter's vision of Latin, symbolised by the iconic figure of Camillus fighting off the Gallic invaders, was more static.

An attempt to revive spoken Latin—a supreme example of comic language, as Francesco Tateo has pointed out[12]—was made by Poggio in his *Facetiae*. For him the fact that Latin (spoken and written) was the language of the ancients, and therefore different from the modern language (also spoken and written) which had derived from Latin through the centuries, did not mean that the ancient tongue could no longer be used as a living language.

The *Facetiae* is a collection of brief anecdotes and tales which, from the middle of the fifteenth century, has assumed an importance undoubtedly greater than anything Poggio himself might have imagined possible. The work was read avidly and published provocatively, especially in areas affected by the Reformation, with the aim of propagating a negative image of the Roman clergy. In fact many of the *Facetiae* describe obscene situations involving priests and monks. It was, in effect, the light-hearted, comic version of the more serious anticlerical reflections which Poggio wrote in the dialogue *Contra hypocritas*. Paul IV placed the *Facetiae* on the Index, with the result that it enjoyed the fate of many banned books: it became an unwitting symbol of the free thinking which emerged as a reaction to the great prohibitions of the Counter-Reformation, and achieved success above all because it mocked the Roman Church.

The *Facetiae* has aroused great interest among modern commentators, partly on account of its linguistic importance. The work in fact achieves the utopian ideal of breathing life back into the Latin language, the authority of which had been seriously undermined in Italy by the great works in the vernacular by Dante, Boccaccio and Petrarch—who, incidentally, represents a paradox, in the sense that he himself had always nurtured a particular affection for his own works in Latin, which the humanists considered the beginning of the revival of the *studia humanitatis*. The Latin of the *Facetiae* is, strictly speaking, highly contaminated: from the point of view of syntax, inasmuch as it is clearly influenced by the sentence construction of the vernacular; from the point of view of lexis, in that there are sometimes significant bor-

---

[12] Tateo F., "La raccolta delle *Facezie* e lo stile 'comico' di Poggio Bracciolini", in *Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1980)* (Florence 1982) 207–233.

rowings from the Tuscan dialect—for example, *Facetiae* 239, which is entitled *Confessio Tusca et postea brusca*.

The work is a hybrid, then. It dates back to the same years in which Leon Battista Alberti, in the famous foreword to Book III of *Della famiglia*, perspicaciously decreed the total failure of the humanist plan to revive Latin. In the years after, Alberti himself used Latin frequently (for example, in his majestic political romance *Momus sive de principe*): it is precisely for this reason that his opinions on the subject of the vernacular carry such singular weight and that his foresight appears so remarkable. For him the use of the vernacular was paradoxically a form of Ciceronianism: just as the Roman orator had used Latin to make himself understood by his fellow citizens, so the modern writer should use the vernacular in order to be understood by his contemporaries. Being Ciceronian, then, did not mean imitating Cicero, but rather consisted in expressing oneself with the same clarity and precision as Cicero. Later Poliziano and, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, Erasmus in his *Ciceronianus* would agree: for these two humanists the real Ciceronian is not the writer who copies phrases from Cicero but the one who has a knowledge of Latin from every era, or in other words who knows Latin as well as Cicero did. Or as Alberti might have put it, the writer who is at ease with the communicative forms of his own time.

The idea for the *Facetiae*, which, according to Poggio himself, had to be considered as conversations (*Confabulationes*, he called them), dates back exactly to the period in which Alberti identified the irreversible demise of the Latin language. Both Poggio and Alberti gravitated around the Roman curia, one of the greatest strongholds of classicism, where at the beginning of the sixteenth century Latin would still be considered pre-eminent over the vernacular. Sannazaro in fact, influenced by Roman friends, would anachronistically convert from using the vernacular in *Arcadia* to using Latin in *De partu Virginis*. If it is legitimate to transpose a political metaphor to the field of language, one might say, paraphrasing Valla in the preface to the *Elegantiae*, that the attempt to revive 'spoken' Latin—of which the *Facetiae* was perhaps the most ambitious manifestation—was as doomed as the nostalgic yearning for the empire in Dante's *De monarchia*: a final and highly intelligent account of an era on which the sun had set.

Select Bibliography

FERA V., "L'*imitatio* umanistica," in G. Bernardi Perini (ed.), *Il Latino nell'età dell' Umanesimo. Atti del Convegno (Mantova, 26–27 ottobre 2001)* (Florence 2004) 17–33

FUBINI R., "La coscienza del latino negli umanisti", in *Umanesimo e secolarizzazione da Petrarca a Valla* (Rome 1990) 1–75

PATOTA G., "Latino e volgare, latino nel volgare", in G. Bernardi Perini (ed.), *Il Latino nell'età dell'Umanesimo. Atti del Convegno (Mantova, 26–27 ottobre 2001)* (Florence 2004) 109–166

RIZZO S., "I latini dell'Umanesimo", in G. Bernardi Perini (ed.), *Il Latino nell'età dell'Umanesimo. Atti del Convegno (Mantova, 26–27 ottobre 2001)* (Florence 2004) 51–95

——, "Il latino nell'Umanesimo", in A. Asor Rosa (ed.), *Letteratura italiana. Le questioni* (Turin 1986) 379–408

TATEO F., "La raccolta delle *Facezie* e lo stile 'comico' di Poggio Bracciolini", in *Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1980)* (Florence 1982) 207–233

——, "Quale latino per i moderni?", in G. Cavallo – C. Leonardi – E. Menestò (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo I, La produzione del testo 1* (Rome 1992) 154–164

TAVONI M., *Latino, grammatica, volgare. Storia di una questione umanistica* (Padova 1984)

PART III

PERFECTIONS?

'THE CLASSICS' AS POTENTIAL
FOR THE FUTURE: THE 'HIGH PERIOD'
OF ANCIENT LATIN LITERATURE[*]

GREGOR VOGT-SPIRA

I

When studying the continuity of Latin literature—indeed a remarkable phenomenon!—, we do not merely envisage it as a continuum, but subject it to periodisation at the same time. Only such a division into different epochs, themselves subjected to further subdivisions, e. g. the common triad of early, middle and late phases, raises the question of the different periods' characterisation and comparability, which forms the basis of this book.

The recent debates on literary historiography have led to the understanding that in literary history, eras are not given as such, but are the results of determinations for which, however, there are no binding criteria.[1] Hence, a certain degree of haziness is ineluctable, not only with respect to the boundaries, but particularly with regard to the standards used for drawing them, e.g. the role of political history. Therefore, in particular cases, the resultant periodisations differ considerably. Yet, notwithstanding this plurality, the determinations of epochs are not governed by sheer arbitrariness. As a rule, they are the results of complex historical processes and thus are reception phenomena which in their turn can affect the course of literary historiography too.

The productiveness of such internal subdivisions influences the history of Latin literature in an exemplary way. This comprises not only the division into the three great eras, which determines our general view of history. Right from its beginning, Latin literature has always

---

[*] Translated from the German by Iannis Goerlandt, revised by Dr. Boris Dunsch.

[1] See e.g. Perkins D., *Is Literary History Possible?* (Baltimore–London 1992).

had a bivalent structure: the initial orientation towards Greek literature and culture does not disappear, but is preserved well into the Imperial era. Hence, Eduard Norden could use the relationship to Greek literature as a 'criterion' for Roman literature in his influential literary history.[2] This peculiar 'bivalence'[3] entails a specific disposition towards reflection within literary historiography, and soon leads to the development of differentiated outlines for the course of literary history. The establishment of a phase of gradual rising followed by a 'high period', which is soon canonised, as well as the different ways in which later periods respond to such a peak, has proved to be very influential.

Therefore, the 'high period' of ancient Latin literature, which is the subject of this chapter, is not an arbitrary differentiation of modern literary historiography: rather, this discrimination is founded in classical and post-classical processes of canonisation. For two reasons, this period seems to be important with respect to the phenomenon of the continuity of Latin literature. Firstly, it is mainly in this period that the patterns originate, the more or less strict imitation of which founds the extraordinary tradition in the first place. Secondly, in this era, with its doctrine of literary *imitatio*, a strategy of textual production is developed and secured institutionally. This strategy, with its specific orientation towards older models as a possibility for the future, generates one of the major characteristics of the Latin literary tradition.

Exactly how long this 'Golden Age' of Roman literature lasts, however, is a question to which the answers are manifold. They depend on how rigorous the definition of 'peak' is set. Incidentally, opinions differ both on the number of peaks and their qualification. In particular, the question is whether the Ciceronian–Augustan period should be considered as one, or rather as two different 'peak periods', and whether these do or do not deserve to be labelled as 'classical'.[4]

For each approach, detailed motivations and justifications may exist. The disagreement in itself, however, points to a key problem. Fix-

---

[2] Norden E., *Die römische Literatur* (Leipzig 1952⁴) 3.

[3] See Vogt-Spira G., "Literaturgeschichtsschreibung", in H. Cancik – H. Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*, 15 vols. in 18 (Stuttgart–Weimar 1996–2003) 7:329–333, esp. 331.

[4] For recent observations on this issue with pertinent positions founded in German philosophy of history, see Schmidt E.A., *Augusteische Literatur. System in Bewegung* (Heidelberg 2003); for an abbreviated version, see Schmidt E.A., "Strukturmerkmale einer literaturgeschichtlichen Epoche: Die augusteische Literatur", in H. Jaumann et al. (eds.), *Domänen der Literaturwissenschaft* (Tübingen 2001) 191–212.

ing a 'high period', whether one labels it as 'golden', 'classical' or, with biological imagery, as 'bloom' or 'maturity', is inherently characterised by a fundamental tension, namely the ultimately irresolvable tension between normativity and historicity. Judgmental distinction and chronological progression are two fundamentally different perspectives, which can never be correlated completely.[5]

This is already apparent in the common outline literary historiography has established for grasping ancient Latin literature, which is at the root of this volume as well. Basically, this outline is established in the course of the sixteenth century; in it, a blueprint of the course of all of Latin literature is designed and, also, in the context of making the *antiqui* accessible, Latin literature in particular is subjected to historical classification, which is possible only from a distant perspective.[6] Mostly three, sometimes four phases are discerned. The common model of the ages of man (youth, maturity and decline) is the most influential. Some time before the mid-sixteenth century, the imagery of metallurgy is transposed to linguistic and literary history as well. Ever since, the denominations 'Golden Age' and 'Silver Age' of Latin literature have been integral parts of periodisation.[7]

This protohistorical unlocking of the sources (*ad fontes*) owes its stimulus to a fundamentally normative orientation towards classical antiquity as a whole: its literary models represent the 'mother tongue' of 'classical' Latin, from which, so it is claimed, one has become alienated, and which needs to be regained.[8] *Classici*, a term which, after Gellius's singular undertaking,[9] has been used explicitly for authors of the highest

---

[5] This bidimensionality has to be regarded as the basic premise of the subject at hand: for a good introduction see e.g Voßkamp W., "Normativität und Historizität europäischer Klassiken", in W. Voßkamp (ed.), *Klassik im Vergleich. DFG-Symposion 1990* (Stuttgart–Weimar 1993) 5–7. In the various national science cultures, this tension is deliberated upon in different ways: while in German research the primacy of historicity leads to a widespread mistrust of literary evaluation (a representative is Schmidt, *Augusteische Literatur* [note 4] 7), in France and Italy, the tradition of literary criticism presents itself as stronger and as a matter of course, whereas from an Anglo-American point of view, the dominant paradigm is literary criticism, which well-nigh can encompass literary history as a subcategory.

[6] See Julius Caesar Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem*, eds. L. Deitz – G. Vogt-Spira, 5 vols. (Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt 1994–2003), esp. book 5, ch. 1 in vol. 4.

[7] See Ax W., "Quattuor linguae Latinae aetates. Neue Forschungen zur Geschichte der Begriffe 'Goldene' und 'Silberne Latinität'", *Hermes* 124 (1996) 220–240.

[8] Scaliger, *Poetices* (note 6) book 5, ch. 1 in vol. 4:42. 12–14.

[9] Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 19. 8. 15.

rank since the early sixteenth century,[10] therefore, in the following centuries, becomes identical to the *antiqui* in general. This is still evident in the contemporary nomenclature 'Classical Antiquity' or 'Classical Philology'.

This makes clear that 'classical' does not primarily aim at historical organisation and, specifically, does not require a concept of periodisation,[11] but that it manifests itself within a 'practical' concept of literature: 'classical' means 'belonging to a repertoire of models deemed exemplary which one can turn back to and which serves as a point of orientation'.[12]

For the projection of this normative distinction on a particular historical period, therefore, no clear-cut regulative standard exists, notwithstanding that the literary works set as examples are temporary phenomena themselves. Thus, in common usage, the meaning of the epithet 'classical' oscillates between a generic term for all of antiquity and a qualification of one or two shorter phases within the 'peak period' of Roman literature.

Returning to the discussion of the duration of the 'high period' under consideration here, it has become clear how strongly the discrimination of this duration depends on the different approaches and points of view. In this volume, on the basis of the triple division of the history of ancient Latin literature, the 'high period' is assumed to be of medium duration. Its upper limit are the years about 100 B.C., during which, even in ancient self-conception, the early phase of Roman literature

---

[10] Possibly for the first time in Beatus Rhenanus; see Pfeiffer R., *Die Klassische Philologie von Petrarca bis Mommsen* (Munich 1982) 111.

[11] 'Classicism' (*Klassik*) as designation for an epoch is the 'Resultat einer späten Sonderentwicklung'. See H. Stenzel, "Klassik als Klassizismus", in H. Cancik – H. Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*, 15 vols. in 18 (Stuttgart–Weimar 1996–2003) 14:887–901, here 888.

[12] See also the apposite wording from the perspective of reception studies in Galinsky K., *Augustan Culture: An interpretative Introduction* (Princeton N.J. 1996) 349: 'True classicism […] is a far cry from replication and epigonism. Rather, it involves the attempt to recapture the spirit of the classical model for one's own time'. The close connection of the epithet 'classical' with such a 'practical' concept is clear, albeit indirectly, even in G.B. Conte's claim, argued strictly on the basis of historical knowledge, that '[t]here is only one way for the modern interpreter to grasp the value and the meaning of ancient literature, and that is precisely to forget that it is called *classical*, a term that all too readily induces in the modern reader the complacement belief of easy accessibility (this is the familiar humanistic illusion that imagines it is rendering past literature more up-to-date by seeking within the direct confirmation of a contemporary interest)' (*Latin Literature. A History* [Baltimore–London 1994] 3).

ends. In accordance with a widely accepted caesura, we set its lower limit at 284 A.D., which is followed by a period commonly referred to as 'Late Antiquity', in keeping with the nomenclature Jacob Burckhardt introduced in 1853, even though no clear-cut boundaries have been set so far.[13]

The era fixed by these two boundaries, however, is by no means a constant and continuous 'high period' lasting for over four centuries—rather, it shows an extensively differentiated internal physiognomy. The period begins with both aforementioned peaks, namely the Late Republican-Ciceronian and the Augustan eras. These are followed by phases that react to these peaks, such as the Neronian-Flavian era, which fluctuates between anticlassicism and classicism, and the so-called 'archaism' of the second century. The late second as well as the third century, finally, appear as a phasing out of the pagan literature oriented towards Rome and as a shift to Christian as well as legal writing.

It thus becomes clear how complex the internal structure of this period of ancient Latin literature's 'peak' really is, which, as the acme of classical Latin literature, has provided a large part of the normative models. In the context of the theme of the continuity of Latin literature and with respect to possible ways of comparing it with other 'high periods', this contribution aims at reassessing this era, addressing the following central questions:

1. How does the differentiation of a 'peak' come about in Roman literary history; what are its criteria and conditions; how is a new phase distinguished from a preceding one, and at what point can such a canonisation be observed.
2. Is it justifiable to label this phase (or these phases) as 'peak' or as 'golden', 'classical' and the like: what makes it/them 'classical'.
3. Which part does the doctrine of literary *imitatio* play in the establishment of such a 'high period'.
4. What is the internal physiognomy of the defined period: to what extent can tension or co-presence between different characteristics be observed.

---

[13] See the overview in Herzog R., "Einführung in die lateinische Literatur der Spätantike", in R. Herzog (ed.), *Restauration und Erneuerung. Die Lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*, Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike VIII.5 (Munich 1989) 1–44.

5. Finally, are there unifying factors which 'transform' a mere time span into an 'era', and how do 'literary' and 'extra-literary' factors affect this process.

II

First, however, we need to specify the notions 'high period' and 'peak', which have been the subject of a lively debate about what is 'classical'. Simply for terminological reasons, this debate has taken divergent courses in the different science cultures and scientific languages.[14] Therefore, we now present some general characteristics of common notions already to be found in the Latin terminology, to which we will have recourse later on:

1. Declaring someone to be exemplary implies a selection and, consequently, canonisation; therefore, in Greek, 'the Classics' are called 'the chosen' (οἱ ἐγκριθέντες).

2. Selecting requires distance, the process of canonisation can only be carried out from a distant perspective: the notion of 'the Classical' is a reception phenomenon inasmuch as 'the classics' always have to be the ancients, as E.R. Curtius adroitly puts it.[15]

3. The selection is not made for the sake of the past, but for the sake of the present. From a normative perspective, and recalling the (intentionally) paradoxical wording of our title, 'the classics' thus carry the potential for the future.

4. Hence, the selection can be altered as well: the definition of what the normative 'classics' are or what is considered normative in them, can evolve and differ. This is evident especially in the Late Republican-Augustan 'Golden Age', in the range of stylistic and political adroitness, which can be approached from the point of view of an aesthetics of production as well as of hermeneutics. Thus, it is a dynamic relationship, particularly because the orientation towards the classics essentially is competitive: the norm

---

[14] Especially because of the differentiation between *Klassik* ('classical periods') and *Klassizismus* ('Classicism'), which specifically exists in German and which has lead to the (aporetical) 'Problem des Klassischen'. In this contribution, 'classical' is not used according to the meanings it acquired in the German history of ideas in particular, but in the structural sense which will be explained hereafter.

[15] Curtius E.R., *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern–Munich 1984[10]) 256.

which the exemplary model represents itself has to be realised, and
the reception of the classic helps to establish this norm—even if it
serves as a vehicle for establishing the norm by means of an inter-
pretative act. Insofar as it is successful and convincing, a reception
hence carries the potential of a new 'classical' era.

These are the conditions from which the specific quality of 'the classi-
cal' grows and in which the construction of 'classical' periods is
founded. Therefore, it is clear that it really is such a normative ori-
entation which generates the categories 'classical' or 'high period' in
the first place, and that it stands in direct opposition to a more his-
torical orientation. Heuristically, two approaches can be distinguished
(although they are of course interrelated). On the one hand, in order to
study the effects of canonisation, 'a classical period' can be interpreted
as a literary reception phenomenon. On the other hand, 'a classical
period' can be understood as an object characterised as 'classical', so
that the 'classic' texts themselves can be studied, too.[16]

III

For the description of the course of Roman literary history, a charac-
teristic evolutionary model has been established that follows the bio-
logical imagery of growth, bloom and decay. As mentioned before, it
is inevitable that the course as a whole can only be perceived from a
distance. In this respect, Marcus Hieronymus Vida's *Poetics* can be said
to be paradigmatic, being one of the earliest and, until the nineteenth
century, most widely used Renaissance poetics.[17] Vida notices a rapid
ascent from boorish and artless beginnings, culminating in the appear-
ance of Vergil—the history of literature is confined to poetry—, who is
compared to bright weather after clouds and rain:[18]

---

[16] As proposed in W. Voßkamp, "Normativität und Historizität" (note 5) 5–6.
[17] All quotations are taken from Williams R.G., *The "De arte poetica" of Marco Girolamo
Vida. Translated with commentary, and with the text of c. 1517 edited* (New York 1976). With
respect to the conceptual meaning, see Vogt-Spira G., "Von Auctoritas zu Methode.
Vergil als literarisches Paradigma in der *Poetik* des M.G. Vida", in C. Zintzen (ed.),
*Saeculum tamquam aureum. Internationales Symposium zur italienischen Renaissance des 14.-16.
Jahrhunderts (Akademie Mainz)* (Hildesheim 1997) 151–163.
[18] Vida, *De Poetica* 1. 166–173: "Vergil cleansed the filth and neglect left by the
ancients, and set / everything forth anew, made more excellent by his miraculous art.
[…] This one man had a genius and / art excelling all the sons of the Greeks, sur-

> Virgilius, qui mox veterum squalore situque
> deterso in melius mira omnia rettulit arte
> vocem animumque deo similis […].
> Unus hic ingenio praestanti, gentis Achivae
> divinos vates longe superavit, et arte,
> aureus, immortale sonans. Stupet ipsa, pavetque,
> quamvis ingentem miretur Graecia Homerum.

Characteristically, in what follows Vergil is regarded as the representative figure of his time: Latium could not have been prouder of any other era. The reason given for this is that Latin reaches the highest level of perfection precisely in this period, and such a line of reasoning makes it clear that such an evaluation is founded on an orientation towards language and stylistics.[19]

Vida makes use of a canonisation established in Rome soon after the death of Augustus which considers the entire Ciceronian–Augustan era to be a peak period in literary development. We encounter traces of this canonisation in a digression on literary history in Velleius Paterculus's Roman history, written around the year 30 A.D., not even one and a half decades after the death of Livy and Ovid:[20]

> No slight prestige is added to the consulship of Cicero by the birth in that year—ninety-two years ago—of the emperor Augustus, who was destined by his greatness to overshadow all men of all races. It may now seem an almost superfluous task to indicate the period at which men of eminent talent flourished. For who does not know that at this

---

passing by far their / godlike poets. All golden he is, a singer of immortal songs. Greece / herself, though she admires great Homer, reels and trembles / before him." (trans. R.G. Williams).

[19] Vida, *De Poetica* 1. 174–177.

[20] Trans. F.W. Shipley. Velleius Paterculus 2. 36. 1–3: "Consulatui Ciceronis non mediocre adiecit decus natus eo anno divus Augustus abhinc LXXX⟨X⟩II, omnibus omnium gentium viris magnitudine sua inducturus caliginem. Iam paene supervacaneum videri potest eminentium ingeniorum notare tempora. Quis enim ignorat diremptos gradibus aetatis floruisse hoc tempore Ciceronem, Hortensium, anteque Crassum, Cottam, Sulpicium, moxque Brutum, Calidium, Caelium, Calvum et proximum Ciceroni Caesarem eorumque velut alumnos Corvinum ac Pollionem Asinium, aemulumque Thucydidis Sallustium, auctoresque carminum Varronem ac Lucretium neque ullo in suscepto carminis sui opere minorem Catullum. Paene stulta est inhaerentium oculis ingeniorum enumeratio, inter quae maxime nostri aevi eminent princeps carminum Vergilius Rabiriusque et consecutus Sallustium Livius Tibullusque et Naso, perfectissimi in forma operis sui; nam vivorum ut magna admiratio, ita censura difficilis est." – For a discussion of the meaning of this document see Wlosok A., "Die römische Klassik: Zur 'Klassizität' der augusteischen Poesie", in W. Voßkamp (ed.), *Klassik im Vergleich* (note 5) 331–347, esp. 343.

epoch, separated only by differences in their ages, there flourished Cicero and Hortensius; a little earlier Crassus, Cotta, and Sulpicius; a little later Brutus, Calidius, Caelius, Calvus, and Caesar, who ranks next to Cicero; next to them, and, as it were, their pupils, come Corvinus and Pollio Asinius, Sallust, the rival of Thucydides, the poets Varro and Lucretius, and Catullus, who ranks second to none in the branch of literature which he undertook. It is almost folly to proceed to enumerate men of talent who are almost beneath our eyes, among whom the most important in our own age are Vergil, the prince of poets, Rabirius, Livy, who follows close upon Sallust, Tibullus, and Naso, each of whom achieved perfection in his own branch of literature. As for living writers, while we admire them greatly, a critical list is difficult to make.

The 'men of eminent talent' are enumerated according to genre; when, finally, 'those who have achieved perfection in their own branch of literature' are mentioned, they appear to be standing at the peak of their genres.[21] Almost in the fashion of a skilled dramatist, Velleius Paterculus integrates the Ciceronian era in such a way as to bridge the temporal gap by forging a link between the coincidence of Cicero's consulship and Augustus's year of birth. It seems the obvious thing to do for a historian to select a politician as the point of orientation for the periodisation of literary history. Still, the invariability of this connection over a period of two thousand years remains remarkable, a fact of which the epithet 'Augustan' bears witness. Admittedly, the parallelisation of political and literary or cultural history is not a feature to be found only in Velleius Paterculus; already in Cicero's 'history of oratory' in *Brutus* it is mentioned explicitly.[22]

Thus, a relatively short period of not even a century is established as the peak of Roman literature. However, as a brief look at Greek literary history makes clear, this process of periodisation is all but self-evident.[23] There, a 'classical' canon was established not until the third century B.C.—the 'classical period' defined in Alexandrian philology spans half a millennium, having Homer and Menander as its peaks on either side. Moreover, because Homer was seen both as the starting point and the acme of perfection, real evolution was impossible in literary history: the

---

[21] Wlosok, "Die römische Klassik" (note 20) 343 leaves unresolved to whom this evaluation refers. Whereas formally, it refers only to the latter and, strictly speaking, should be limited to one exponent of his genre in each case, the evaluation is meant to refer suggestively to the enumeration as a whole.

[22] Cicero, *Brutus* 13–16.

[23] See Vogt-Spira G., "Literaturgeschichtsschreibung" (note 3) 331.

singularity of his eminence, as Velleius Paterculus repeats as well,[24] was based on the fact that there had neither been a poet before him that he could imitate nor one after him capable of imitating him—which, by the way, does not accord with Vergil's concept of himself. This constellation has definitely lead to the fact that, in Greek history of literature, the concept of 'the classical' could not be applied in the same way as for Rome: the process of defining norms and the approach concerned with literary evolution, as for instance the identification of a cultural 'high period' in fifth-century Athens, are too divergent, especially because, from the perspective of canonisation, Homer has always been the classic *par excellence*, without even requiring the qualities of a 'Golden Age' or even a 'classical period' in the modern historical sense.

In Rome, the situation is quite different. Essentially, the rapid establishment of the Ciceronian–Augustan era as a 'high period' is not first and foremost an achievement of philological canonisation, but rather a reaction to self-concepts and self-definitions, and thus reflects an extraordinary pretence which has endured until and has been accepted even in very recent histories of literature: '[A]uf fast allen Gebieten der Literatur hatten […] lateinischschreibende Autoren […] Werke geschaffen, die sich ihren griechischen Vorbildern ebenbürtig zur Seite stellten oder sie sogar übertrafen'.[25] Indeed, the idea of literary competition is of great importance. This agonistic character of the relationship to Greek literature can be illustrated by a number of instances. A first example is the striking frequency of the topos of the *princeps*: Horace, for instance, is said to have been the first to adapt the Aeolian poetry of Sappho and Alcaeus to the tunes of the Italic lyre and to acquaint Latium with the iambs of Archilochus—following, more precisely, the rhythms and the spirit of the model, not the *res et verba*. Or Vergil, who in the *Bucolica* claims to be the first to have imitated Theocritus, and also Propertius, who mentions Callimachus and Philetas seven times, albeit that these serve as points of orientation rather than models.[26] These examples bear witness to a self-awareness which is presented as comparable to the Greek models. The expectations of that era can be exemplified by Propertius's famous verse *Nescio quid maius* about the still unfinished *Aeneid*, with the idea that something greater than the *Iliad*

---

[24] Velleius Paterculus 1. 5. 1–2.

[25] Dihle A., *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Munich 1989) 56.

[26] Horace, *Carmina* 3. 30. 13 ff.; *Epodes* 1. 19. 23–33; Vergil, *Bucolica* 6. 1 ff.; Propertius 3. 1. 1 and *passim*.

was coming into being.[27] The fact that *imitatio* as a cultural achievement is highly esteemed, is attested by the remark ascribed to Vergil that it is easier to wrest the cudgel from of the hands of Hercules than a verse from Homer.[28] Here, the course that literary criticism will take is set out, with its typical pattern of syncrisis, e.g. when Cicero is appraised as *Platonis aemulus* and as the equal of Demosthenes, and Sallust as the *aemulus* of Thucydides, or when Varius's *Thyestes* is deemed comparable to any Greek tragedy.[29]

In accordance with this kind of agonistic relationship to the Greeks, the own literary development is interpreted as progress, as advancement. At the same time, this allows the clear delimitation of a preceding phase of Latin literature and the establishment of one's own achievements as innovations.[30] In this respect, the *aemulatio* of the Greeks is important inasmuch as, within the different genres, domains are defined in which the Romans can or cannot compete with the Greeks (an example of the latter is the art of writing comedies, the cultivation of which is discontinued in the first century B.C.). In Cicero's opinion, for instance, the level of sophistication of Greek rhetoric has been reached for the first time by Antonius and Crassus.[31] In this evolutionary model, early Roman literature is notoriously considered *rudis*, boorish, uncouth, etc.,[32] because it does not meet the standards yet. This interpretation, though narrow and not at all consistent, proves to have been very influential. Thus, the models are interpreted as a challenge, and accordingly, the own literary advancement as having gained from those standards: the Romans, as Friedrich Leo put it, measured the absolute value of literary achievement 'durch die auf den relativen Wert gerichtete Vergleichung mit den Griechen'.[33]

---

[27] Propertius 2. 34. 65 ff.

[28] Suetonius–Donatus, *Vita Vergilii* 46.

[29] Cicero: Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 10. 1. 123; 105. Sallust: Velleius Paterculus 2. 36. 2; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 10. 1. 101. Varius: *Institutio oratoria* 10. 1. 98.

[30] For a brief discussion of this process, see Citroni M., "L'idea di arcaico nella valutazione Ciceroniana della poesia Latina del passato", in G. Vogt-Spira et al. (eds.), *Die Konstruktion des Archaischen* (forthcoming).

[31] Cicero, *Brutus* 138.

[32] Ovid, *Tristia* 2. 424; Horace, *Sermones* 1. 10. 66 and *passim*.

[33] Leo F., *Die griechisch-römische Biographie* (Berlin 1901) 194.

IV

First, focusing on this time span of approximately a hundred years that is considered a 'high' or 'peak' period already in Roman self-descriptions, we can enquire into the legitimacy of its definition as 'golden' or 'classical', as well as into the reasons for its rapid accep-tance. For that, another look at Rome's relationship to Greek culture is necessary. A statement of Seneca the Elder (chronologically very close to Velleius Paterculus) on the definition of the Ciceronian epoch as the 'high period' of Roman oratory can elucidate this relationship:[34] all that Roman oratory could boast of, Seneca said, in order to set it against Greek insolence or be superior to it, had reached its peak in Cicero's time; all talents that have fostered and furthered our work, originated in that period.

  This attests that the Greek assertion of cultural hegemony, which had remained unimpaired for a long time indeed, is considered a provocation. Cicero's ambivalent stance, for instance, is paradigmatic. On the one hand, he often programmatically mentions the agonistic relationship with the Greeks; on the other hand, he is remarkably proud of the fact that the Romans can claim models of their own, e.g. in the field of oratory. Sometimes he even claims knowledge of one's own literature to be a necessary part of cultural literacy and education, regardless of the question whether the Roman version is inferior to a Greek masterpiece, as e.g. in the case of Atilius's poor translation of the *Electra* of Sophocles.[35] Thus, literature seems to be linked to a project of identity formation. Varro's writings, for instance, are praised in a telling manner: according to Cicero, they shape identity by explaining the age of Rome, the chronology of its history as well as the laws of its religion, by clarifying etymologies, and by providing information about poets and Latin literature and language in general—from this, Cicero concludes, insight is to be gained about who we are and where we come from.[36] Therefore, finally, the intensive imitation of the Greeks—according to the Horatian maxim one should 'turn over the Greek models night and day'—is concomitant with an increasing

---

[34] Seneca Maior, *Controversiae* I praef. 6–7.
[35] Cicero, *De finibus* I. 2. 4 – 3. 10.
[36] Cicero, *Academica* I. 3. 9.

self-awareness: it is no coincidence that in Augustan poetry, the epithets *Romanus* or *Latinus* are often highlighted.[37]

This climate is conducive to the establishment of the authors of the first century B.C. as 'classics'. Another decisive factor, however, is the extensive development of the education system in the Imperial era: straight away, authors of the Late Republican-Augustan phase— Cicero, Vergil and Livy in particular—are included in the school curriculum, which lays the foundations for their canonisation. This, in its turn, is related to the securing of a high-level literary culture, an aspect we will discuss in the next section.

In view of this rapid canonisation process, however, we first have to consider the legitimacy of the labels 'golden' or 'classical' as well as the specific norms they represent. Even though, over the centuries and millennia, different interpretations of these labels have been in use, a number of characteristics can be discerned, especially when taking into account the respective self-descriptions. A first characteristic is the intensity of formal refinement that assimilates the Callimachean art programme which has been received and adapted in Rome since the Neoteric Poets. On the one hand, it comprises the refinement and perfection of expression and rhythm on the principle of the *limae labor*.[38] This high formal refinement is not merely operative at the level of the word, but at that of composition in general as well. In Horace's *Epistula ad Pisones*, known as the *Ars poetica* since Quintilian and regarded as the theoretical manifesto of the poetry of the Roman 'classical period', a number of key concepts can be found, e.g. that a successful work of art should feature unity and well-ordered wholeness.[39] This leads to a practice of production which, paradigmatically, can be characterised with an anecdote from Suetonius's *Vita Vergilii*: it is handed down that Vergil, working on the *Georgica*, usually dictated a great number of verses each day, early in the morning, and spent the remainder of the day revising them and reducing them in number, saying that he brought his poem into being in a fashion not unlike that of a she-bear, bringing it into shape by licking.[40]

---

[37] Horace, *Carmina* 4. 3. 23; Properce 4. 1. 64.
[38] Horace, *Ars poetica* 291.
[39] The key-words are *simplex*, *totum*, *unum*, *lucidus ordo* etc. Horace, *Ars poetica* 23; 34; 41).
[40] Suetonius–Donatus, *Vita Vergilii* 22.

Such intensity of formal refinement needs regulative concepts such as the central notion of the—originally rhetorical—principle of propriety (πρέπον; in Latin terminology *aptum*, *decorum*), which becomes a decisive factor in stylistics and characterisation. Closely related to this are the postulates of unity and verisimilitude as they are programmatically formulated by Horace. It would be interesting, however, to know to what extent these concepts were realised in Ovid's commended *Medea* or in Varius's lost *Thyestes*, which in later literary criticism was said to be comparable to the tragedies of the Greeks:[41] after all, earlier and later drama does not seem oriented towards this norm at all and, as Horace observed elsewhere, nor did the contemporary audiences really worry about it.[42]

This self-concept, however, is not limited to formal issues: a normative role is likewise claimed for the socio-political sphere. In poetry, this mainly concerns Vergil and Horace. They activate and recode the old concept of the *vates*, which lends this claim a religious dimension. Behind this, there is a strong self-estimate as a public authority that takes a critical and judgmental stance towards the present and even claims to view it from a universal perspective. Such a claim is advanced to the point at which even the emperor is forced 'in die Rolle des Normunterworfenen'.[43]

Especially in the last century and a half, this is a key factor in the establishment of an 'Augustan classical period', because, ultimately, the actual and influential normative force lies exactly in this specific view on man and history.[44] To what extent, however, such an interpretation—which in later periods can only be identified hermeneutically—really brings about the canonisation under the heading of 'the chosen' and thus, consequently, as 'classical', remains doubtful, since in the

---

[41] Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 10. 1. 98.

[42] Horace *Epistulae* 2. 1. 183–192. – The scepticism in Schmidt E.A., *Augusteische Literatur* (note 4) 9 note 14 towards the broad application of the category 'classical temperance' (*Klassische Dämpfung*) to Augustan literature is justified. The plausible examples, however, did not prevent Augustan poetry from being received as a model of a classicistic aesthetics later on, even though this was a highly selective interpretation.

[43] Wlosok, "Die römische Klassik" (note 20) 340.

[44] Often, this has been discussed only in terms of affirmation or criticism been reduced (particularly prominent with respect to the question whether the *Aeneid* was to be interpreted as pro- or anti-Augustan). The involvement of literature, however, is much more complex. See on this, programmatically Schmitzer U., "Die Macht über die Imagination. Literatur und Politik unter den Bedingungen des frühen Prinzipats", *Rheinisches Museum* 145 (2002) 281–304.

Imperial age, as in the poetics of the Early Modern Period, the dominant view on literature is a grammatical-rhetorical one.[45] Nevertheless, to a certain degree Augustan literature indisputably has an ethical stance.

<div align="center">V</div>

The establishment of Ciceronian–Augustan literature as a 'high period' and thus as 'classical', as we have said earlier, does not merely owe its longevity to its literary physiognomy, but also to later institutional developments of the Imperial period. The development of an advanced literary culture which, at the same time, is founded in a specific way of dealing with preceding literature, is of particular importance. We have also recorded the fully unhistorical but fundamental tendency that referring to the past serves the interests of the present: the canonised authors are used in order to learn the best mode of expression from the best examples.[46] This tendency is supported by the doctrine of literary *imitatio*, which at the end of the first century B.C. became the leading principle and then, through grammatical and rhetorical education, left its mark on the traditional education of the leading class.

In this context, certain concepts of writing and dealing with texts were developed that became extraordinarily stable. This development is demonstrated particularly in Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, with which the Early Modern Period links up seamlessly. The letters of Pliny the Younger, complementing the more theoretical expressions of the doctrine, are also instructive in this respect. In his self-stylization as man of letters under the conditions of *imitatio* the system of textual production is reflected in manifold ways; his introspections provide immediate insight in the way the process of textual production up to final perfection is conceived, and about his views on the relation between textual production and mode of life, and about many other aspects

---

[45] An illuminating example are the different interpretations of Vergil. Whereas in the twentieth century, with its many crises, the uniqueness of the *Aeneid* could be based on the perception that it 'helped many generations […] to formulate their views on the chief problems of existence' (Bowra M., *From Virgil to Milton* [London 1945] 34), Julius Caesar Scaliger, who has been the main authority for Vergil's singular excellence for many centuries, did not need a hermeneutical perspective for the claim that the poet should be regarded as a godlike peak, excelling any other mortal mind. The dividing line between such premodern views on literature and our own standards of interpretation is yet to be studied extensively.

[46] See note 12.

—considerations which, in the Modern Period, will return in the de-
bates on *imitatio*.[47]

The doctrine of literary *imitatio* proves to be an ingenious system
set between the poles 'referring to models' and 'autonomy of the new
author', which, moreover, is open to the future; the possibility of sur-
passing them always exists, because none is reckoned to have reached
perfection so far. Quintilian's chapter *De imitatione* can be considered
representative of this system.[48] Because, as we said earlier, art produc-
tion was to a large extent based on imitation, *De imitatione* belongs to the
cultural-anthropological tradition that interprets imitation as positive
and productive: though invention comes first and is most important,
Quintilian says, it is useful to conform to those inventions that have
stood the test of time. The fact that the technique of *imitatio* always
remains ambivalent, however, is not forgotten: naturally, it would make
things easier in comparison with the situation of those who did not have
a model, but it would also be dangerous to simply settle for that which
their predecessors have found. For, in that way, cultural progress would
be impossible: if mankind had been satisfied with what it had already
learned, there would never have been anything new.

In this context, it is instructive to consider what kind of exam-
ples Quintilian uses to illustrate such mental inertia.[49] In poetry, he
says, Livius Andronicus would have marked our supreme achievement,
likewise the annals of the Pontifices in historiography, and navigation
would have been limited to sailing on rafts—the comparison clearly
demonstrates the opinion on early Roman literature established as early
as the Augustan era. Therefore, as a dynamising factor and counter-
balance, a quest to surpass the models is introduced in the doctrine:
because no art has remained in its initial state, the follower must add
something. The aim of taking the lead is postulated even for those who
do not aim at supreme excellence, because following in the footsteps of
others necessarily means lagging behind, as it is conveyed in a strong
image. Furthermore, Quintilian says, it is generally easier to exceed
than to produce an exact likeness.[50] Poliziano, however, drawing on the

---

[47] See the watershed study McLaughlin M.L., *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance*
(Oxford 1995). On Pliny, see Vogt-Spira G., "Die Selbstinszenierung des jüngeren
Plinius im Diskurs der literarischen imitatio", in L. Castagna – E. Lefèvre (eds.), *Plinius
und die Transpadana* (Munich 2003) 51–65.
[48] Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 10. 2; for the following §1–7.
[49] Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 10. 2; §7.
[50] Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 10. 2; §9–10.

same strong imagery, would later emphasise the impossibility of following previous tracks in an identical manner: such an attempt, he notes, would impede running. This is an example of a shifted emphasis, indicating that the problem would also be defined differently.[51]

From this educational-psychological perspective concerned with the individual, imitation is thus interpreted as operational. It is important that the object of imitation is not the aim of the imitation process, but rather an independent assimilation of the models. This process, which has often been reflected upon, is illustrated most impressively in the influential 'bee simile'. With the transformation of pollen into honey, both the process of refinement and the final product's novelty and innovativeness are artfully illustrated.[52] An important consequence of such an operational view on imitation, related to rhetoric and stylistics, is that neither the national nor the chronological provenance of the models matter in this system. This can be demonstrated by the bilingual canon of *eminentissimi* ordered by genre, without discriminating or highlighting epochal events.[53] On closer examination of the Latin authors, however, in their respective genres the Ciceronian–Augustan authors generally prove the highest in rank. Indirectly, the period was thus canonised as the 'high period' of Roman literature by means of the closed list of authors as well.[54]

Nevertheless, this cannot be considered a differentiation of epochs yet—in the strict sense of the word, ancient Latin literature was not periodised, as we have pointed out, until the sixteenth century, when it could be viewed in its entirety, and even then this periodisation came as a gradual process. A very influential periodisation is Julius Caesar Scaliger's, which was devised shortly after the middle of the sixteenth century. There, probably for the first time, the four-part division with the definition of the separate period 'Late Antiquity' (*senectus*) is used.[55] The endeavour of the *Hypercriticus* in his *Poetics*, namely to study and reconsider Latin literature by means of distinguishing different periods, is an example of the protohistoricism of the Renaissance. The concurrence of two incompatible, incommensurable and not homogenized interests is apparent in the introductory remarks to the differ-

---

[51] The correspondence between A. Poliziano and P. Cortese in E. Garin (ed.), *Prosatori latini del quattrocento* (Milano–Naples 1952) 902–911, esp. 904.

[52] Seneca, *Epistulae ad Lucilium* 84; after him Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1 praef. 5–10.

[53] Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 10. 1. 45–131.

[54] This is pointed out in Wlosok, "Die römische Klassik" (note 20) 344.

[55] See Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem* (note 6) vol. 5, esp. "Einleitung" 25–41.

ent periods. Contrary to the other periods, the second, 'classical' era, for instance, is considered to have featured all virtues that nature has bestowed on poetry simultaneously. Also, its effulgence and grace are peculiar, and no author is to be found whose style is affected and artificial.[56] This emphatic judgment, therefore, establishes a unified 'Golden Age', which, however, does not preclude the fact that in particular cases, literary criticism has produced some critical estimations of e.g. Sabinus, Ovid and—albeit to a lesser extent—even Horace.[57]

In the introduction to Neronian-Flavian literature, which, according to the periodisation used in this book, is still considered part of the 'high period' of Roman literature and which, from the point of view of the Early Modern Period, contains a rich selection of authors worth imitating, another illuminating idea is mentioned: because all subject matter has been exhausted, all laws of poetry have been tested and all gracefulness has been drawn from them by their predecessors—Vergil in particular—, the poets of the later period were forced to speak of the same in a different way, in order not to be forced to repeat the same. Hence, Scaliger says, their simplicity and grace were lost, even though their styles were 'magnificent and full' (*grandes et pleni*).[58] The principals of chronological ordering and analysing fundamental stylistic qualities are thus closely intertwined. Additionally, the stylistic characteristics in the works of Neronian-Flavian authors such as Seneca, Lucan or Statius are interpreted as resulting from the specific circumstances of production of a literature facing a 'classicism' that had been established as exemplary—an explanation not too far removed even from the views of contemporary historians of literature.

Even though this is an area of tension between protohistorical and normative orientations, the latter is definitely the more important one. In this respect, the end of the book is characteristic: after a detailed critique of Horace, it leads to a praise of Vergil, though the structure of the book in itself hints at the *telos* of the work as well.[59] However, in the short and resumptive section, Vergil, contrary to the traditions of ancient grammar, is exempted from criticism and corrections, as he surpasses all other mortal minds. This indicates the blind spot in Scaliger's

---

[56] Scaliger, *Poetices* (note 6) book 6, ch. 7 in vol. 5:310.

[57] Scaliger, *Poetices* (note 6) book 6, ch. 7 in vol. 5:322; 324–350; 364 ff.

[58] Scaliger, *Poetices* (note 6) book 6, ch. 7 in vol. 5:270: 'Quare necesse fuit, ut illa gratia simul periret cum ipsa simplicitate, cum tamen essent grandes et pleni […]'.

[59] Scaliger, *Poetices* (note 6) book 6, ch. 7 in vol. 5:468.

work: Vergil's normativity as the highest peak imaginable—and the same holds true for Cicero's in the debate on Ciceronianism—can no longer be furnished with reasons as such, but is simply claimed.[60]

VI

When the tension between normative and historical orientation is irresolvable, this means that, on the one hand, because of the need to provide reasons for the normativity of the *auctores veteres* which is no longer sustained by continuity, surreptitiously, a literary-historical order is established that is incompatible with such normative orientation. On the other hand, the point of view of literary criticism—which, necessarily, focuses on individual authors—often discovers so many individual characteristics that, generally, the synthetic definition of 'epochs', insofar as it exceeds a mere chronology, tends to be undercut.

The internal physiognomy of the 'high period' of Roman literature clarifies this, because it proves to be highly differentiated and anything but consistently 'golden'. Moreover, in the case of some of the greatest of the Late Republican era—e.g. Catullus and Lucretius for poetry, Sallust for prose—, a different appreciation of prose and poetry can be observed: mostly, the label 'classical' is used only for prose, which in this phase attains to the 'classical' form of the Latin language; however, even here the orientations can differ substantially, as the debate on Asianism vs. Atticism or Sallust's characteristical archaism demonstrate. Poetry is classicized one generation after prose: though Catullus and Lucretius are soon considered the greatest of their time, they were not 'classics' in the same sense as the Augustan poets, on the grounds of their using long and sometimes complex periods. With the Augustan poets they had in common their self-confident mastery of the Hellenistic literary techniques. Lucretius, however, combines them with elements of the Early Latin tradition, while Catullus introduces the register of colloquial Latin, his versification fluctuating from the lightest and most elegant fluency to unpolishedness, which later could be construed as ponderousness.

---

[60] Vogt-Spira G., "Warum Vergil statt Homer? Der frühneuzeitliche Vorzugsstreit zwischen Homer und Vergil im Spannungsfeld von Autorität und Historisierung", *Poetica* 34 (2002) 323–344.

Although a closer examination creates an impression of extensive plurality within a single period, one can also look at it from a different perspective. This can be illustrated by example of the Neronian period, a short phase of a remarkable concentration of cultural productivity, which has been received in a very distinctive way. Incidentally, this is the only epoch in Roman literature, apart from the Augustan, that has been named after an emperor. Now, for the Neronian era, *pervertere* seems to be a structural principle which comprises many contemporary phenomena, not in the sense of a totalising principle, but as an expression of the main cultural tendency, embedded in a political context in which inversion is used as a mode of exercising authority.[61] By means of the technique of *pervertere*, e.g. the breach of guiding norms considered to be generally accepted can be decried, but in particular it aims at the paradigms of the Augustan era, by transforming a *locus amoenus* into a *locus horridus*, for instance, or by reinterpreting the concept of *fatum* in e.g. the *Aeneid* as a 'cruel providence', etc.[62] Even though in Roman culture the technique of inversion is nothing new, the density, the complexity and the high level of formal mastery of the application of such *pervertere* is striking, especially in Seneca, Lucan and Petronius.

If one takes into account this virtuosity, it seems right to designate this phase as a 'high period'; yet, since the sixteenth century, this period has been called the 'Silver Age'.[63] And indeed, there are obvious differences with the classical 'Golden Age'. This holds true not only with respect to stylistic aspects—there the differences are so distinct that, in the nineteenth century, the Neronian age could even serve as a model for the construction of a 'Late Antiquity'. More important, however, is the double orientation resulting from the awareness of having been preceded not only by the Greeks, but also by a *Roman* epoch canonised as a 'high period'—the epochal impact of this awareness has been discussed by Julius Caesar Scaliger.[64] This double orientation produces a wide range of attitudes, from imitation ('classicistic') to outright divergence ('anti-classicistic'). The ever-present potential of the Greek mod-

---

[61] See Castagna L. – Vogt-Spira G. (eds.), *Pervertere: Ästhetik der Verkehrung. Literatur und Kultur neronischer Zeit und ihre Rezeption* (Munich 2002) 305–310.

[62] See already Narducci E., *La provvidenza crudele. Lucano e la distruzione dei miti augustei* (Pisa 1979); recently also Narducci E., *Lucano. Un epico contro l'impero* (Rome–Bari 2002) and, for a large number of areas, the case studies in Castagna L. – Vogt-Spira G. (eds.), *Pervertere: Ästhetik der Verkehrung* (note 61).

[63] On the origins of this nomenclature see note 7.

[64] See note 58.

els, then, is tapped in particular by the Flavian epic poets, which results in many a striking interference. Generally, it can be maintained that, throughout the first century B.C., this complex system of connections is shaped in such a productive way that the literary output can definitely be regarded as part of a 'high period', in which the stylistic diversity is apparent as well.

Regarding the further developments, we can study the example of Tacitus, who explores and expands the stylistic techniques of historiography in such a manner that, in the Early Modern Period, the 'Tacitean' and 'Ciceronian' styles could be regarded as the main alternative of 'classical' Latin prose—which was, until recently, mirrored in the 'prose composition' exercises of academic education. Tacitus' mode of thought, serving, with its strategic, persuasive use of syntactical inconcinnities, laconisms and suggestive ellipses, runs totally contrary to the system of norms of Ciceronian prose. Sallust's partial influence, however, shows that, at the same time, this is a style typical of the genre; the counter-example of the—in accordance with is rhetorical theme— 'Ciceronian' *Dialogus* shows that, in the works of one and the same author, a synchronous presence of different styles can be observed.

Traditionally, Tacitus marks the end of the 'high period' of Roman literature. In the history of Latin literature by Schanz–Hosius, for instance, the period from Hadrian to Constantine is labelled as a 'Periode zum Teil größter Öde',[65] and as such it continues a long tradition; since the sixteenth century, with regard to poetry, the 'Silver Age' has been interpreted to have ended around 100 A.D., and to have been followed—with gaps of several centuries—merely by a period of decline. More recent research has sought to reinterpret this long period, because, particularly the second century has known important and influential prose writers such as Suetonius, Gellius and, most notably, Apuleius. A weighty argument against the lopsided view that it was a period of decline is the circumstance that Tertullian and Minucius Felix mark the beginning of a succession of great Christian writers—a succession, however, which the year 284 does not divide into separate periods at all.[66]

This again raises the question of periodisation. From this perspective, it follows that Tacitus was received as marking the end of an

---

[65] Schanz M. – Hosius C. (eds.), *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian*, 5 vols. (Munich 1914–1935) 3: V.

[66] See Herzog, "Einführung" (note 13).

era. After him, certain shifts can be discerned on the basis of which
the fundamental orientation of the Roman literature of the preceding
centuries was gradually superseded by other tendencies. It is remark-
able that in Rome, from the second century onwards, Greek litera-
ture gains ground—for which the bilingual culture sets the stage. This
is accompanied by a shift in the system of genres: for the first time
in Roman history, philosophy definitely becomes more reputable and,
after the example of the Adoptive Emperors, almost fashionable. Thus,
certain orientations come into prominence which the Christian appro-
priation of pagan culture would be able to connect with and refer to.
Also, the main interest begins to shift from production to interpreta-
tion, the future importance and influence of which cannot be overesti-
mated. The grammatical-rhetorical approach to literature, however, is
not abandoned, but becomes just one of many approaches—albeit an
extensively cultivated one. This results in a different interpretation of
the Roman 'classics': one example is Macrobius's later interpretation of
Vergil, which brings together grammatical-rhetorical and hermeneu-
tical traditions.[67] Here, though, one can still discern efforts to inte-
grate those stylistic aspects that form the basis of the periodisation of
an epoch as 'classical', 'golden' or even 'silver', but even so, there is a
tension between the different traditions and approaches. When, finally,
the Christian writers' literary production peaks in the fourth and fifth
century A.D., this emphatically illuminates how periodisations based
on content are at odds with those commonly used in literary historio-
graphy.

VII

In conclusion, let us turn to the fifth central question, namely whether
there is a common, fundamental feature uniting our time span of
almost four centuries, in the face of the evident internal diversity.
After all, the periodisation of ancient Latin literature in three large
epochs established in literary reception history seems to presuppose
such a general, synthesizing factor, albeit implicitly. The problem of
the unity of epochs, however, inevitably leads to an aporia. Therefore,
the question should be asked the other way around, namely whether

---

[67] See Flamant J., *Macrobe et le néo-platonisme latin, à la fin du IVe siècle* (Leiden 1977)
esp. 172–232.

there is something specifically new distinguishing this phase from the preceding one which could also explain its key role in the continuity of Latin literature.

To do that, one must look beyond individual authors and separate genres. Instructive in this respect is the research on ancient literacy initiated by W.V. Harris, in which our period from the Late Republic to the third century A.D. is highlighted as the phase in which written culture was founded most firmly, as a kind of 'high period of literacy' (*Literarisierung*)[68] As a matter of fact, this is a characteristic by which the literature of our phase can be considered part of a larger picture, viz. this literarisation process (*Prozesses der Literarisierung*), which throws into relief numerous phenomena.

From this perspective, two traits of the system of literature established in the 'high period' catch the eye in particular. In this system, there proves to have been a highly developed, very dense network of internal relations that creates a separate, literary sphere in Latin language. Secondly, at the same time a pragmatic reproduction procedure is developed that ensures the continuity of the system as a whole and guarantees a high literary standard in general, rather than a number of single peak achievements. In the first hundred years of the Late Republican-Augustan period, to a certain extent, the emphasis is on the first aspect, while the reproduction procedures have been put into effect, laying a broad cultural foundation, in the centuries after Christ. Yet, only the combination of both could construct the 'Classical Latin Literature' which became the main orientation point of Latin literature in times to come. We will now briefly discuss some fundamental aspects of this development.

One of the most striking characteristics of Late Republican and particularly Augustan literature is the development of an extraordinarily high level of literary referentiality. The repertoire of the past—covering Greek literature from Homer to Hellenism as well as early Roman literature—is available in its entirety and is used extensively. This is carried out in the sense of an inventory of 'literature' as a whole, with the aim to 'draw on all previous traditions to create a surpassing whole'.[69]

---

[68] Harris W.V., *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge Ms. – London 1989) 175–284: "The Late Republic and the High Empire, 100 B.C. – 250 A.D." Discussion and additions in M. Beard et al., *Literacy in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor 1991).

[69] Galinsky, *Augustan Culture* (note 12) 345–346 on the general characterisation of 'Augustan classicism' in art, architecture and literature. To the extent that the entire repertoire is put to use, qualifying the phase as 'constructive eclecticism' (Schmidt,

It is principally poetry that, almost paradigmatically, strengthens and deepens the network of references and allusions intensely.[70]

In the case of Rome, this is the consequence of a dynamic literarisation process, primarily since the second century B.C. With regard to Greece, however, the establishment of such a complex internal literary system can be observed since early Hellenism, which for the Romans even serves as an explicit example in this respect. Nevertheless, in Greek literature nothing comparable to Roman 'Classicism' has come into being. This points to the fact that, apart from the immanent conditions of literature itself, there are external conditions, too.

A decisive factor is the interplay between political stability and the centrality of Rome. Other than in the Greek-Hellenistic context, in Rome the literary and political centre is one and the same until late into the Imperial era. Therefore, to a certain extent, it is correct to discriminate from all succeeding phases of 'Roman' literature both the early and our phase as 'Latin' literature.[71] Yet, this is complemented by the specific development of Rome from the Late Republican into the Imperial era. For the relation between literature and politics is unquestionably a complex one: Rome does not know an integration of these spheres as does Greece; apart from historiography and oratory—which at first, however, is by no means seen as 'literature'—literary activity initially does not concern the upper class. This holds true

---

Augusteische Literatur [note 4] 29 ff.; approvingly Wlosok, "Die augusteische Klassik" [note 20] 341) indeed is appropriate. However, this does not constitute an argument against classifying the phase as 'classicism', as Schmidt thinks. If its point of reference were but the Athenian 'classic period' of the fifth and perhaps the fourth century, then a modern periodisation would be projected onto Antiquity unhistorically: irrespective of the problematic epochal construction (*Epochenproblematik*) of 'Greek Classicism' on account of the case of Homer—Vergil does not rival Homer as an archaic poet in Herder's sense!—, such an epochal construction (*Epochenbildung*) is genuinely alien to the *imitatio*-model, even though sometimes there is an interference of attempted epochal constructions. Moreover, Roman reception of Greek culture clearly shows how *Graecia* is regarded as a monolithic counterpart, lacking the subtle internal differentiations which are made in our handbooks of literary history.

[70] See Barchiesi A., *Speaking volumes. Narrative and intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets* (London 2001) and, specifically on the epic genre, Hardie Ph., *The epic successors of Virgil. A study in the dynamics of a tradition* (Cambridge 1993).

[71] See Fuhrmann M., "Die römische Literatur", in M. Fuhrmann (ed.), *Römische Literatur* (Frankfurt a. M. 1974) 1–32. He asserts (p. 1) that one should 'nur die Literatur als "römisch" bezeichnen […], die sich auf das politische Gebilde Roms bezog und von daher ihre Impulse empfing—mit anderen Worten: Der Ausdruck "römische Literatur" läßt sich nur auf die lateinische Literatur der Antike—von etwa 250 v. Chr. bis etwa 250 n. Chr.—anwenden.'

especially in the case of poetry: the low social background of the majority of the poets in the Republican era is symptomatic for the evaluation of literary activity.

At the same time, the system change accompanying the principate, which shook up the public sphere and the opportunities for influence it offered, had direct consequences for the literary sphere as well. From the perspective of politics, a highly differentiated literary culture serves an explicitly positive function: the administrative challenges of a world empire call for an 'official' literary elite; at the same time, literary competence becomes a social necessity.[72] These challenges form the backdrop for the success of the 'humanistic' type of education in the sense of the ideal developed in Cicero's *De oratore*. This development is accompanied by an internal process of 'technologizing of the word' of which, as a conclusion, we will outline some indicators.

An instructive case is public oratory, inasmuch as its strong pragmatic functions are originally constitutive of the genre. Therefore, it is remarkable that, when Cicero's *Brutus* offers a history of oratory aimed at turning oratory into literature, this reinterpretation in effect divests oratory of its real communicative-situative function, and—while it is presented in writing and hence is assessed according to its literary quality—is, in a strict sense, no longer 'oratory'. Thus, an interpretation of Roman oratory as a process of increasing literarisation can be found here[73]—a highly anticipative cultural-historical complement to Tacitus's later interpretation of decadence. For, when the genre is depragmatised and consequently, without Cicero having foreseen the full impact of this shift, becomes structurally detached from its direct political context, this lays the foundation for a later development, namely that rhetoric as an educational force and as a 'school of stylistics' will be able to create a new universal framework. When, in the Imperial era, published oratory finally is even considered the ideal archetype (*archetypon*) and, consequently, almost systematically favoured over its verbal counterpart,[74] then the shift to literature has taken place explicitly.

---

[72] See Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (note 68) esp. 232 ff.

[73] For a more detailed discussion, see Vogt-Spira G., "Rednergeschichte als Literaturgeschichte. Ciceros *Brutus* und die Tradition der Rede in Rom", in C. Neumeister – W. Raeck (eds.), *Rede und Redner. Bewertung und Darstellung in den antiken Kulturen* (Möhnesee 2000) 207–225.

[74] Pliny, *Epistulae* 1. 20. 9.

   The backdrop for this process is an emphatic concept of literacy
(*Schriftlichkeitsbegriff*), traces of which can be found everywhere. In the
Late Republican era, for instance, there is a remarkable plea for the
capacity and potential of the written word:[75] the disadvantage of the
communicative distance inevitable in writing, it is said, would be com-
pensated by literary technique, artistic awareness and literary educa-
tion. This creates a field of reference which makes the orator—again
with respect to the highly instructive domain of rhetoric—independent
of the concrete circumstances, and which thus creates a sovereignty
over the imponderabilities of the performance situation. This notion
is even extended to the reception side on the grounds that the speaker's
'spirit' and the entire array of his emotions permeate the written form
as well, so that reading, too, can inspire the spirit of the great authors—
a fundamental idea in all written cultures to come! This concept of
literacy is so emphatic that, at the end of the first century, Cicero is
pronounced the epitome of oratory and considered the measure of indi-
vidual progress: the more you like him, the more you have advanced![76]
When the designation 'Cicero' enters the interval between concrete text
and measure of perfection, this is an extraordinary abstraction process.
Although the consequences of this process were drawn as late as in
the debate on Ciceronianism in the Early Modern Period, the ten-
sion emerging from this was already articulated in the early Imperial
era: namely, that the process of literary perfection is potentially inter-
minable.
   All in all, this is the expansion of a 'literary sphere',[77] which is also
visible in the appreciation of techniques that secure a high written
fecundity in the phase of remarkable literariness (*Literalität*). However,
the old and in the Late Republican-Augustan Era extremely virulent
area of tension between the social-political sphere with its traditional
value system and the establishment of a specific 'literary sphere', is still
present in the second century, regardless of its expansion.[78] Hence with
regard to the continuity of Latin literature, the decisive factor is not the

---

[75] Cicero, *Brutus* 82–94, esp. 91–94.

[76] Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 10. 1. 112.

[77] Translating a modern concept, this has occasionally been called 'autonomisation'
as well: Cova P.V., *La critica letteraria di Plinio il Giovane* (Brescia 1966); for a similar
assessment, see Snell B., "Arkadien. Die Entdeckung einer geistigen Landschaft", in
B. Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes* (Göttingen 1985[4]) 257–274, esp. 263.

[78] See, e.g., Pliny, *Epistulae* 5. 3. 1–6; for a discussion Vogt-Spira, "Die Selbstinsze-
nierung des jüngeren Plinius" (note 47) 63–64.

difference between public and literary sphere, but rather its integration and institutional and normative securement through grammatical and rhetorical education.

Therefore, we can conclude that the 'high period' of ancient Latin literature became a 'high period' not only because it comprised individual peaks, but because, at the same time, it set the very standards by which it could be assessed as such. In this way, it also established a normative system of differentiated literacy (*Schriftlichkeit*), reaching in time past Latinity: a system, which, henceforth, would serve as point of reference in the modern national languages.

Select Bibliography

Primary sources

SCALIGER J.C., *Poetices libri septem. Sieben Bücher über die Dichtkunst*, ed., trans., introduction and commentary by L. Deitz – G. Vogt-Spira, with cooperation of M. FUHRMANN, 5 vols. (Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt 1994–2003)

WILLIAMS R.G., *The "De arte poetica" of Marco Girolamo Vida. Translated with commentary, and with the text of c. 1517 edited* (New York 1976)

Secondary literature

AX W., "Quattuor Linguae Latinae Aetates. Neue Forschungen zur Geschichte der Begriffe 'Goldene' und 'Silberne Latinität'", *Hermes* 124 (1996) 220–240

BARCHIESI A., *Speaking volumes. Narrative and intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets* (London 2001)

BEARD M. et al., *Literacy in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor 1991)

CASTAGNA L. – VOGT-SPIRA G. (eds.), *Pervertere: Ästhetik der Verkehrung. Literatur und Kultur neronischer Zeit und ihre Rezeption* (Munich 2002)

CONTE G.B., *Latin Literature. A History* (Baltimore–London 1994)

GALINSKY K., *Augustan Culture: An interpretive Introduction* (Princeton N.J. 1996)

HARDIE PH., *The epic successors of Virgil. A study in the dynamics of a tradition* (Cambridge 1993)

HARRIS W.V., *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass. – London 1989)

MCLAUGHLIN M.L., *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance* (Oxford 1995)

PERKINS D., *Is Literary History Possible?* (Baltimore–London 1992)

SCHMIDT E.A., *Augusteische Literatur. System in Bewegung* (Heidelberg 2003)

SCHMITZER U., "Die Macht über die Imagination. Literatur und Politik unter den Bedingungen des frühen Prinzipats", *Rheinisches Museum* 145 (2002) 281–304

Vogt-Spira G., "Literaturgeschichtsschreibung", in H. Cancik – H. Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*, 15 vols. in 18 (Stuttgart–Weimar 1996–2003) 7:329–333

——, "Rednergeschichte als Literaturgeschichte. Ciceros *Brutus* und die Tradition der Rede in Rom", in C. Neumeister – W. Raeck (eds.), *Rede und Redner. Bewertung und Darstellung in den antiken Kulturen* (Möhnesee 2000) 207–225

——, "Warum Vergil statt Homer? Der frühneuzeitliche Vorzugsstreit zwischen Homer und Vergil im Spannungsfeld von Autorität und Historisierung", *Poetica* 34 (2002) 323–344

——, "Die Selbstinszenierung des jüngeren Plinius im Diskurs der literarischen imitatio", in L. Castagna – E. Lefèvre (eds.), *Plinius und die Transpadana* (Munich 2003) 51–65

Voßkamp W. (ed.), *Klassik im Vergleich. DFG-Symposion 1990* (Stuttgart–Weimar 1993)

——, "Normativität und Historizität europäischer Klassiken", in W. Voßkamp (ed.), *Klassik im Vergleich. DFG-Symposion 1990* (Stuttgart–Weimar 1993) 5–7

Wlosok A., "Die römische Klassik: Zur 'Klassizität' der augusteischen Poesie," in W. Voßkamp (ed.), *Klassik im Vergleich. DFG-Symposion 1990* (Stuttgart–Weimar 1993) 331–347

MASTERING AUTHORS AND AUTHORIZING MASTERS IN THE LONG TWELFTH CENTURY

Jan M. Ziolkowski

The long twelfth century witnessed many, extraordinarily rapid and extensive changes. In this study I will identify developments in the roles of *magistri* over this one-hundred-fifty-year period. My examination will entail looking at twelfth-century understandings of *magister*. It will also involve exploring the relations of masters to authors and authority. Once masters undertook to produce their own chefs d'oeuvres, far-reaching adjustments were required in the curriculum as well as in attitudes toward the masterworks of earlier eras.

Let me explain in more detail what I hope to achieve. First, I will deliver in a few brushstrokes a *Forschungsbericht* on what work has been done lately on masters in the long twelfth century, from 1075 to 1225, roughly. Then I will paint the background of what *magister* meant in antiquity and the early Middle Ages and what new denotations and connotations it unfolded in the twelfth century. Against this backdrop, I will hazard a few ideas about the place the master occupied in the social and intellectual structures of the times, vis-à-vis knights, tradesmen, students, and of course the Church. Finally, I will evaluate the effects of writing by masters on the curriculum of texts by authors they interpreted. The whole will comprehend seven short parts.

Modern Masterliness

An overview of *magistri* in the long twelfth century demands not only gazing through a telescope at the remoteness of the Middle Ages but also peering through bifocals at the past thirty years. In the anti-authoritarian late sixties the only books with the relevant word on their covers that garnered much attention in the Anglophone world were the very popular *Human Sexual Response* (1966) and *Human Sexual*

Inadequacy (1970) of Masters and Johnson.[1] But obviously (if maybe sadly) this Masters is no more germane to our subject of *magistri* than is that other inadvertently master-laden issue, masturbation. From the late 1960s through the 1980s blistering academic debates focused not upon masters but instead upon authors. In 1987 the famous assertion that the author was dead was capped and canonized in an article with the retrospective title "What was an Author?"[2]

The wrangle over the demise of the author now looks almost as quaint as the New Criticism and structuralism which preceded it, since times and predilections have changed. Since the 1990s masters have emerged from the shadows and have even stepped forward to share the limelight with authors. The past dozen years have seen a burgeoning curiosity about medieval schoolmasters, particularly of the twelfth century. Jacques Le Goff's *Intellectuals in the Middle Ages* was finally published in English translation in 1993.[3] C. Stephen Jaeger's *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950–1200* came into print in 1994.[4] Peter Godman's *The Silent Masters: Latin Literature and Its Censors in the High Middle Ages* appeared in 2000.[5] More broadly, George Steiner's *Lessons of the Masters*, ponderings on the ties between masters and disciples through the ages, became available in 2003.[6] Beyond studies that make masters an overriding preoccupation (even if the relevant keywords are sometimes absent from their indices), the *magister* plays a bit part in almost every tome on twelfth-century intellectual history. Yet gaps remain. For example, the entry on *masters* in the index to Le Goff's classic contains no page references to the chapter on the twelfth century, while the index to Jaeger's wide-ranging volume has no heading at all for master. It is into these voids that we will now leap.

---

[1] Masters W.H. – Johnson V.E., *Human Sexual Response* (Boston 1966) and *Human Sexual Inadequacy* (Boston 1970). Masters was a gynecologist, Johnson a psychologist. These books and others by them (many co-authored with Robert C. Kolodny) were based on their observation of sexual activity in a laboratory setting.

[2] Nesbit M., "What Was an Author?", *Yale French Studies* 73 (1987) 229–257.

[3] Le Goff J., *Intellectuals in the Middle Ages*, trans. T.L. Fagan (Cambridge, Mass. 1993).

[4] Jaeger C.S., *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950–1200* (Philadelphia 1994).

[5] Godman P., *The Silent Masters: Latin Literature and Its Censors in the High Middle Ages* (Princeton 2000).

[6] Steiner, G., *Lessons of the Masters* (Cambridge, Mass. 2003).

Twelfth-Century Understandings of Magister

An appraisal of masters and mastery in the twelfth century poses extraordinary challenges because of the many shadings that the word *magister* could have. In Classical Latin the noun denoted 'he who directs or commands' and 'he who teaches'. In Christian Latin the term is also applied to preachers of the Christian faith, most importantly the apostles.[7] In all cases the position and authority of a *magister* are known as *magisterium*, whence the English *mastery*.

Magisterium is also narrowly the power conferred upon Christ and the pastors of the Church so that they can be the ministers of salvation.[8] Although the noun *magisterium* is nowhere found in the Bible, the status of Christ himself as not just a *magister* but the preeminent *magister* is emphasized, above all in two verses in the Gospel according to Matthew: 'But be not you called Rabbi. For one is your master; and all you are brethren' (Matthew 23.8) and 'Neither be ye called masters; for one is your master, Christ' (Matthew 23.10).[9]

Christ's status as a *magister* was definitely recognized in the long twelfth century. To take only a single outstanding example, Bernard of Clairvaux (ca. 1090–1153) stresses in one of his sermons that prelates should have as their masters those who have learned how to live from the Master of all:

> I most willingly follow Paul, who out of extreme sweetness mourns those 'who sinned and did not do penance'—Paul, who is stronger than any dominion and power, and who carried off wisdom and the inmost part of holy insights, not from the first or second but from the third heaven. These are our masters, who have learned more fully from the Master of everyone the ways of life and who teach us down to the present day.[10]

---

[7] Weijers O., *Terminologie des universités au XIIIe siècle*, Lessico intellettuale europeo 39 (Rome 1987) 137.

[8] Congar Y., "Pour une histoire sémantique du terme *magisterium*", *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 60 (1976) 87. This study is part of a triptych by the same author, in which the other two panels are "Bref histoire des formes du 'magistère' et de ses relations avec les docteurs'", *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 60 (1976) 99–112, and "Histoire du mot *magisterium*", *Concilium: Revue internationale de théologie* 117 (1976) 129–141.

[9] 'Vos autem nolite vocari rabbi. Unus enim est magister vester; omnes autem vos fratres estis' and 'Nec vocemini magistri, quia magister vester unus est Christus.' *Magister* appears twice as often in the New Testament as in the Old. Whereas in the latter *magister* is generally modified by the genitive of another noun such as 'cooks' or 'soldiery', in the former *magister* tends to be coupled with *discipulus*.

[10] *Sermones in festo sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli, Sermo* 1, paragraph 2, in *Opera,*

Another gauge can be taken from the instances in the latter portion of the *Carmina Burana* where Christ is presented in his guise as *magister* with *discipuli*. Under the inspiration of such evidence, it has even been argued that during this period and slightly later, the very image of Christ in art was shaped by teaching: 'Christ was no longer judge and not yet a martyr but rather a *magister*, expressive of the ineluctable rise of power of masters and students and the *universitas* they comprised.'[11]

In Medieval Latin *magister* 'can be used to refer to anyone whose authority is acknowledged and valued.'[12] The original associations with leadership in general and teaching in particular are extended. In the former case a *magister* comes to be one who serves as superior to a group of junior or apprentices. In the latter a *magister* is not just one who teaches but also one who has received an education which could render him eligible to teach. The noun is often modified by a genitive to make precise the field in which the master has expertise and exercises the privilege of teaching: *magister artium* ('master of arts'), *magister sacre pagine* ('master of Holy Writ'), and *magister grammatice* ('master of grammar'). The only type of teacher who is routinely not designated *magister* is the law professor, who is instead called *dominus* (because of his connection with worldly power, perhaps), creating a terminological distinction that is neatly conveyed in a couple of lines in a poem by Walter of Châtillon (ca. 1135 – ca. 1179): 'I seem to have arrogated from Lords of Laws and Masters of Arts the role of teacher'.[13] Because all these last-mentioned types of mastery presuppose literacy, there develops alongside the idea of the master as a spiritual exemplar an equally powerful one of the master as a skilled reader and interpreter.

---

ed. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais, 9 vols. (Rome 1957–1977) 5:189: 'Libentissime Paulum sequor, qui prae nimia dulcedine luget eos QUI PECCAVERUNT ET NON EGE-RUNT PAENITENTIAM, qui fortior est omni principatu et potestate, sapientiam et medullam sacrorum sensuum non a primo vel secundo, sed a tertio caelo largiter asportavit. Hi sunt magistri nostri, qui a Magistro omnium vias vitae plenius didicerunt, et docent nos usque in hodiernum diem.'

[11] Duby G., *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago 1980) 309.

[12] Teeuwen M., *The Vocabulary of Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages*, CIVICIMA Etudes sur le vocabulaire intellectuel du moyen âge 10 (Turnhout 2003) 97.

[13] Poem 3.3.1–2, in K. Strecker (ed.), *Moralisch-satirische Gedichte Walters von Chatillon aus deutschen, englischen, französischen und italienischen Handschriften* (Heidelberg 1929) 40: 'Ante legum dominos / et magistros artium // usurpasse videor / doctoris officium'.

Etymological Associations of Magister

According to the latest gloss on the etymology of the noun, Indo-European had a form meaning 'greater', which ramified to generate three branches, one leading to such descendants as *major-domo* and *mayor*, another to *majesty*, and the third to *master*.[14] The last grouping derives from the Latin *magister*, which originally would have signified "he who is greater." The form *magister* has oddities. Rather than the combination *magis-* + *-ter*, one would expect the initial component to be *maius*. *Magis* would seem to be an adaptation of the expected **mais*, under the influence of the Latin adjective *magnus* or of an Etruscan word.[15]

Whatever its origins, the word has been very influential. From Latin, sometimes with help from French *maître*, it passed into the Western European languages.[16] But the significations it carries in vernacular literature of the twelfth century often differ sharply from those conventional in Latin. In this regard Chrétien de Troyes' romances are instructive. The noun *mestres* in the sense of teacher or counsellor appears only twice in Chrétien, both instances in his last poem, *Le Conte du Graal* (the romance of *Perceval*).[17] If not fortuitous, the late arrival of this usage in Chrétien could document that the widespread application of *magister* in Latin to designate an intellectual becomes equally entrenched in the vernaculars only after a lag. Initially the teacher in an academic sense may be too Latin a concept for the ambits of the spoken languages.

The derivatives of *magister* in English—which are representative of those found in many Romance and Germanic languages—include *magisterial, magistral, magistrate, master, mister, mistral,* and *mistress*. Not all deriv-

---

[14] On the Indo-European suffixed comparative form **mag-yos-* 'greater', see Watkins C., *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*, 2d ed. (Boston 2000) 52.

[15] See Ernout A. and Meillet A., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, 4th ed. (Paris 2001) 378–379.

[16] A full list would be unnecessary. In Germanic, it appears in OE *mægister, magister*; OFris *māster*; OSaxon *mēster*; OHG *meister*; and ON *meistari* (but not in Gothic). In Romance, it is found in OF *maistre*; Pr. *ma(g)estres*; and Spanish and Italian *maestro*. In Celtic, the Latin word was appropriated as Irish *magister* and Gallic *meistr*.

[17] The word does not figure at all in either *Erec et Enide* or the *Chevalier de la charrette* (*Knight of the Cart*). In *Yvain* it is used only once, to mean governess (1597). It occurs in *Cligés* more than a half dozen times, with the meanings of governess (2962, 3045, 5303, 5308, 5341, 5350, 6194) and master craftsman (5314). The two uses of *mestres* in *Perceval* are at 2393 'A ce mot est avant venuz/ uns chevaliers auques chenuz,/ qui estoit mestres Clamadeu' and 2489 'Et ses mestres qui le consoille'. For convenience' sake, all references are to editions in Les classiques français du moyen âge.

atives date to the Middle Ages. For example, *maestro* took on its present nuance in Italian in the sixteenth century, whence it passed into English only at the end of the eighteenth century and into French and German in the nineteenth.

Formed on the model of *magister* but built upon a principal element exactly opposite to it is *minister* 'he who is less', an inferior, servant, from an Indo-European meaning 'lesser'.[18] The direct lexical descendants of *minister* comprehend *ministry*, *minstrel*, *mystery* (as used in the term 'mystery play'), and *métier*, to say nothing of the paradoxical gastronomic term *minestrone* (a 'big serving'). The complementarity between the compounds of *magis* and *minus* did not escape the notice of those who communicated in Latin, especially in the Middle Ages as end rhyme came into vogue and the appetite for word play grew.[19] The parallels between the compounds were as instantly perceptible to them as is to us the contrast between majuscule and minuscule. Take for instance in what is uttered by the personification of wine in an altercation between water and wine in the *Carmina Burana*:

---

[18] On the Indo-European suffixed zero-grade form **mi-nu-* and its derivatives, see Watkins, *Indo-European Roots* (note 14) 52.

[19] Although the words are occasionally juxtaposed in classical Latin prose, there seems to have been no play on them in classical Latin poetry (*ministra* and *magistratus* do appear once near each other in Manilius, *Astronomica* 5.316–317). But conjunctions of the two appear in more than a half dozen Christian poets, from Late Antiquity through at least the twelfth century. For examples, see Commodian, *Instructiones* 2.23.2, ed. J. Martin, Corpus Christianorum 128 (Turnhout 1960); Paul of Périgueux, *De vita Martini* 2.566–567, ed. M. Petschenig, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (Vienna 1888); Venantius Fortunatus, *Carminum appendix* 34.10, ed. F. Leo, *Venanti Honori Clementiani Fortunati presbyteri Italici opera poetica*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Auctores Antiquissimi 4/1 (Berlin 1881) 291; Alcuin, *Carmina* 26.33, ed. E. Dümmler, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Poetae Latini Medii Aevi 1 (Berlin 1881) 246; Einhard, *Passio Marcellini et Petri* 113.2, ed. E. Dümmler, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Poetae Latini Medii Aevi 2 (Berlin 1884) 134; Walahfrid Strabo, *Vita Sancti Galli confessoris* 1.232–233, ed. E. Dümmler, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Poetae Latini Medii Aevi 2 (Berlin 1884) 435; *Gesta Berengarii imperatoris* 4.151–152, ed. Paul von Winterfeld, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Poetae Latini Medii Aevi 4/1 (Berlin 1899) 400; Peter the Painter (Petrus Pictor) *Carmina* 2.73–74, ed. L. Van Acker, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 25 (Turnhout 1972); Bernard of Morlaix (or Morlaas) *De contemptu mundi* 3.473–474, ed. H.C. Hoskier (London 1929); Nigel de Longchamps (also known as Nigel Wireker or Whiteacre and Nigel of Canterbury) *Passion of St. Lawrence*, 253–254, 611–612, 801–802, 963–966, 1409–1410, 1487–1488, 2079–2080, 2085–2086, ed. J.M. Ziolkowski, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 14 (Leiden 1994) 86, 104, 114, 122, 144, 148, and 178.

I am God, and Ovid
gives evidence of this; by me
wisdom is granted to one and all.
When masters do not drink of me,
they lack understanding, and ministers
do not attend to their studies.[20]

Although many medieval etymologies may be ridiculed for their pre-
posterousness, the analyses of *magister* in the Middle Ages were as
solid as are their modern counterparts. They rested on a lexicographic
bedrock that reached back to antiquity.[21] In this case Hugutio of Pisa
(died 1210) shows a sound grasp of the basic facts about at least the key
initial component of *magister*, as well as of its derivatives:

([21] It is formed with the element *sterion*, which means 'position', and
it is said *maiister, -stri* m., as it were 'greater in position', just as *minister*
is 'lesser in position', and the middle of the aforementioned noun ought
to be written with two i's, one a consonant and the other a vowel, so
that it should be said *maiister*; [22] but because the consonantal i sounds
closely related to g, for this reason (through the fault of the uneducated)
the habit has now taken hold that even among the advanced it is written
with a g; but one letter is also one put for another in word formation and
derivation; moreover, that it is said *magister* (as if more learned) is ety-
mology; [23] whence derive the feminine *magistra, -ae* and the masculine
magisterculus, that is, 'a master small in person or rather in knowledge';
whence the feminine *magistercula*. [24] Likewise, from *magister* come the
adjectives *magister, -a, -um*; the neuter noun *magisterium, -ii*, the dignity or
office of a master; the adjective *magistralis, -le*; and the verb *magistro, -are*,
which means 'to teach', whence Cato 'you will devise something that I
teach you to avoid'; [25] in fact, this *magistro* is the first-person verb and
not the ablative of the masculine noun, as assert certain people who wish
to be called masters before having been learners; and with all its com-
pounds it is transitive. [26] Likewise those who are 'greater' in a town
[cp. 'mayor'] are called *magistri*, namely, senators, consuls, princes, and

---

[20] *Carmina Burana* 193.15, ed. O. Schumann and B. Bischoff, vol. 1, part 3 (Heidelberg
1970) 24: 'Ego deus, et testatur / istud Naso; per me datur / cunctis sapientia. / Cum non
potant me magistri, / sensu carent, et ministri / non frequentant studia.'

[21] For examples of the ancient awareness that *magister* and *magis* were connected,
consider Paul the Deacon, *Epitome* of Sextus Pompeius Festus, *De verborum significatu*,
ed. W.M. Lindsay (Leipzig 1913) 113, lines 11–13 'Magisterare moderari. Unde magistri
non solum doctores artium, sed etiam pagorum, societatum, vicorum, collegiorum,
equitum dicuntur, quia omnes hi magis ceteris possunt' and Iulius Paulus, *Ad edictum
libri LXXX* (in the *Digesta* of the *Corpus iuris civilis*) Book 59 (= 50.16.57) in *Palingenesia
iuris civilis*, ed. O. Lenel, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1889; rept. Rome 2000) 1:951–1308, at 1077 'Cui
praecipua cura rerum incumbit et qui magis quam ceteri diligentiam et sollicitudinem
rebus quibus praesunt debent, hi "magistri" appellantur.'

judges; [27] whence the masculine *magistratus*, describing their dignity, and often *magistratus* is encountered as a collective for the very people who hold the office of master; and *magistratus* is the verbal noun of the verb *magistro, -are*.[22]

The affinity between *magister* and the comparative of *magnus* seems to have been common knowledge. A concise exposition of it figures in Evrard of Béthune's (died 1212) *Graecismus* (ca. 1180–1200), where two lines enjoin: 'Let a *doctor* be of one and a *magister* of many, / say the first from *doceo*, the second from *maior*'.[23] Evrard's formulation of the *magister* as the 'teacher of many' is not merely a play on the distinction between the adjectives *magnus* and *multus*. Rather, it goes back ultimately to ancient Roman schools. In antiquity the primary-school teacher was called the 'schoolmaster' (*magister ludi* [*literarii*]), a term that signals how 'communal school education was the general rule'.[24]

The Magister *and the Structure of Society*

The twelfth century experienced the establishment of the *magister* as a member of a new and distinct social class. It has been famously argued that in the early Middle Ages people viewed society as three-

---

[22] *Derivationes* M 10 [21–27], ed. E. Cecchini, 2 vols. (Florence 2004) 2:722–723 '[21] Et componitur cum sterion, quod est statio, et dicitur hic maiister -tri, quasi maior in statione, sicut minister, minor in statione, et debet scribi media predicti nominis per duo—ii—, unum consonans alterum vocale, ut dicatur maiister; [22] sed quia i consonans affiniter g sonat, ideo ex vitio ydiotarum iam consuetudo inolevit ut etiam apud provectos scribatur per g; sed etiam sepe in compositione et derivatione una littera ponitur pro alia; quod autem dicitur magister, quasi magis doctus, ethimologia est; [23] unde hec magistra -e et hic magisterculus, idest parvus magister in persona vel potius in scientia; unde hec magistercula. [24] Item a magister magister -a -um et hoc magisterium -ii, honos vel officium magistri, et hic et hec magistralis -le et magistro -as -avi, idest docere; unde Cato (Ps. Cato dist. 4 prol. 4) 'invenies aliquid quod te vitare magistro'; [25] est enim hic 'magistro' prime persone et non est hic ablativus, sicut asserunt quidam qui prius volunt dici magistri quam esse discipuli; et est activum cum omnibus suis compositis. [26] Item magistri dicuntur maiores in civitate, scilicet senatores, consules, principes, iudices; [27] unde hic magistratus -tus, eorum dignitas, et sepe magistratus invenitur collective pro ipsis, scilicet qui magistratum habent; et magistratus -tus est verbale huius verbi magistro -as.'

[23] Lines 246–247, ed. J. Wrobel (1887, rept. Hildesheim 1987) 67 'Vnius doctor sit multorumque magister, / A doceo primum dic, a maiore secundum'.

[24] Marrou, H.I., *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. G. Lamb (Madison, Wisconsin 1982) 266.

fold, encompassing *bellatores*, *oratores*, and *laboratores*.[25] These categories corresponded loosely to knights, monks, and peasants. In the early Middle Ages most teachers in the learned Latin world belonged to the 'prayers': schools were monastic, teachers monks. In the twelfth century education completed a migration from often isolated monasteries first to cathedral schools in towns and then to the rudiments of universities. Masters grew more numerous, as did students and books. Simultaneously society had to accommodate masters and students within new or adapted structures. Where in the social order were the *magistri* to be situated?

It might seem logical to maintain the tripartitism by classing the *magistri* as prayers, while reserving *domini* as the title for warriors (and lawyers!). But no such straightforward correspondence prevailed. Instead, the *magistri* were treated as a new category, being neither monk nor knight, with a new method (dialectic) and a new objective (knowledge for its own sake). This newfangled grouping attained its most vivid embodiment in Peter Abelard (1079–1142). Although Jacques Le Goff tags him as 'the first professor', Abelard has better claim to be labeled as the epitome of the new masters.[26] The great dialectician was born into the knightly class and eventually became a monk, but his true profession was as a *magister*. It is no accident that Peter the Venerable (ca. 1093–1156), in the letter he sent to Heloise after Abelard's death, refers pointedly to her former lover and husband as a master,[27] or that in 1140 Pope Innocent II chooses the same title to characterize Abelard. By the same token, it is curious that *magister* is one of the few labels that Heloise opts not to put forward in the notoriously subtle salutations to her personal letters to Abelard, in which she reviews the spectrum of bonds they had shared.[28] Although she prizes Abelard's learning, she chooses to view him as a philosopher and not as a master. What pro-

---

[25] Duby, *The Three Orders* (note 11).

[26] Le Goff, *Intellectuals* (note 3) 35.

[27] Letter 115, in *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, ed. G. Constable, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass. 1967) 1. 307 (compare 304 and 305): 'Hoc magister Petrus fine dies suos consummavit, et qui singulari scientiae magisterio, toti pene orbi terrarum notus, et ubique famosus erat, in illius discipulatu, qui dixit: "Discite a me quia mitis sum et humilis corde."' The passage has been discussed by Clanchy M.T., *Abelard: A Medieval Life* (Oxford 1999) 65 and Godman, *Silent Masters* (note 5) 9.

[28] Heloise never used the word in reference to him: Clanchy, *Abelard* (note 27) 65–66. For curiosity's sake, contrast the *Epistolae duorum amantium* (ascribed to Abelard by Constant Mews, Stephen Jaeger, and others), where the word *magister* is used in reference to the male lover by the female four times in Letter 49C, ed. E. Könsgen,

fessional role (if any) she saw him as playing vis-à-vis her during their affair is hard to guess, but perhaps in giving her individual instruction he was a *doctor* rather than a *magister*.

The kind of corporation the masters eventually formed, the university, bears a striking resemblance to guilds of craftsmen, and it fits with the notion that masters commanded and imparted competencies similar to the crafts of artisans. Nowhere is this likeness more arresting than when Gerald of Wales (1147–1223) draws an unflattering comparison between various tradesmen and the unlettered clerks of his day, in their bafflement before a book:

> Today illiterate clerks are like nobles unfit for war. They remain dumbfounded at the sight of a child's book as before a sudden theatrical spectacle, for they are unaware that these are the instruments of clerks, whereas the blacksmith knows that fishing lines are the instruments of fishermen and the fisherman knows that the anvil and the hammer are instruments of the blacksmith; neither one can exercise the art of the other, but they can both name the other's instruments, despite their ignorance of the instruments' use or technique.[29]

Not specifically on the basis of this passage, but in close proximity to a citation of it, Le Goff opines that: 'Comparable to other city-dwellers, the town intellectual of the twelfth century indeed felt like an artisan, a professional man. His function was to study and teach the liberal arts.'[30] This analogy finds loose support from vocabulary, in that *artisan* is connected with *ars* just as master is with the *artes liberales* and with the art of theology.

Yet despite the vague common ground of shared artistry, it would be a mistake to pay closer heed to the blacksmith and fisherman than to the simile in Gerald's first sentence, which evokes noblemen unfit for war. In fact, the underlying correlation is the one left unspoken, between clerks who cannot handle books and *milites* who cannot wield swords. Although later in the Middle Ages the masters may have envisaged themselves as being like artisans, in the twelfth century their thoughts turned in other directions. For the same reason literary debates between clerics and knights far outnumber those between clerics and tradesmen.

Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 8 (Leiden 1974) 26, once in 66.7, ed. Könsgen, 37, and once in 112A, ed. Könsgen, 60 (in the salutation, no less). In Letter 76, ed. Könsgen, 44, the phrase 'magisterialis institucionis tue sollercia' is used.

[29] Le Goff, *Intellectuals* (note 3) 63.
[30] Le Goff, *Intellectuals* (note 3) 62.

When Benedict of Nursia (ca. 480–550) wrote his rule, the all-male institutions that suggested themselves to him as paradigms for monasteries were the Roman army and, far more, the school. At least in part the former model informs Benedict's summons to his reader in the exordium of his prologue to be obedient 'and armed with the strong and noble weapons of obedience to do battle for the true King, Christ the Lord'.[31] But the latter one leads him to declare in his peroration: 'Therefore we intend to establish a school for the Lord's service'.[32]

In the twelfth century, when autonomous schools proliferated in regions of Europe where they had not operated since Late Antiquity (if ever), their teachers and principals did not base their institutions solely upon monasteries. Rather, like Benedict they looked to the military of their day for a parallel to their activities in training young men to participate in society. Roman love poets had flouted the cardinal values of their contemporaries by presenting erotic relations as the equivalent to military service.[33] *Mutatis mutandis*, twelfth-century intellectuals perpetrated an equally shocking transfer of terminology by couching their missions as schoolmen in the language of knightliness. Bernard of Clairvaux created the Knights Templar by fusing knighthood and monasticism. His nemesis, Peter Abelard, constructed a similar amalgam from the knighthood he had abandoned and the masterliness he could never relinquish. To describe his career, Abelard resorts famously in the *Historia calamitatum* to military language, telling how he preferred to wage war not with swords but with words, not as a knight but as a dialectician, not for Mars but for Minerva.[34] The words he selects suffuse old, classical meanings with new realities of twelfth-century social structures. Thus his *miles* is at once soldier and knight, just as his *castra* embraces both military camp and castle (a word that itself derives from *castra*). When Abelard refers to 'castra scholarum nostrarum', he

---

[31] Prologue 3, *The Rule of St. Benedict in English*, trans. T. Fry (Collegeville, Minnesota 1982) 15. *Benedicti regula*, ed. R. Hanslik, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 75 (Vienna 1960) 2: 'domino Christo uero regi militaturus oboedientiae fortissima atque praeclara arma sumis'.

[32] Prologue 45, trans. Fry (note 30) 18; ed. Hanslik (note 30) 8: 'Constituenda est ergo nobis dominici scola seruitii'.

[33] Lyme R.O.A., *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace* (Oxford 1980) 71–78.

[34] The starting-point of the metaphors is early in the *Historia calamitatum*, lines 19–28, ed. J. Monfrin (Paris 1979) 63–64. Le Goff J., *Time, Work, and Culture in the Middle Ages*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago 1980) 124, comments rightly: 'It is interesting, however, to observe that Abelard expresses himself on the subject of his career with the aid of a military vocabulary, and this choice is surely no mere rhetorical artifice.'

arrogates to masters like himself the attributes of knights.[35] If extended, the metaphor would lead to the analogy that as a *dominus* is to his *castra*, so a *magister* is to his school, or, to state the matter slightly differently, Abelard as a master is to his students as a lord is to his men.

After Abelard, 'master as knight' formulations become common-place.[36] Nowhere is the topos better expressed than in John of Hauvilla's (second half of twelfth century) *Architrenius*, in the phrase 'the knight of Pallas' and in a fuller description of how 'in the same way the soldier of Phoebus, exerting feet and mind to the utmost, hastens to the precincts of Minerva, the sanctuary of learning'.[37] Later John complains of those who are made master at too young an age: 'The boy-soldier enters the Delian camp only to depart again when he has given and received a greeting and given and received a farewell. The title of "Master" is hastily thrust upon him'.[38] Undergirding the *locus communis* is evidently a conviction that callow youths are no more to be made masters than knights:

> Here too anyone may clamber into the teacher's chair, usurping the divine title of 'master', and become pregnant of bombast by this empty dignity. Though both chin and mind are beardless, though he is still a mere green sapling taking precedence over strong and mature timber, he does not hesitate, decked in his hastily bestowed laurels, to lay claim to rewards held in store for age. But having touched on such as these I will leave them unnamed; let the 'master' pass unknown, though his madness is known to all. For it is madness to have sat as teacher and sounded the clear clarion of Minerva before one was of sufficient age.[39]

---

[35] Abelard, *Historia Calamitatum*, lines 130–131, ed. Monfrin, 66; see also 135–136, ed. Monfrin, 67, and 148–152, ed. Monfrin, 67.

[36] For an example not in 'high literature', see the letter in which a student expresses the wish to 'serve longer in the camp of Pallas' ('In castris Paladis disposui longiori spatio militare'): cited by Haskins C.H., *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (Oxford 1929) 19 'in castris Paladis disposui longiori spatio militare'.

[37] *Architrenius*, 3.380, trans. and ed. Winthrop Wetherbee, Cambridge Medieval Classics 3 (Cambridge 1994) 82–83 'Palladis hic miles' and 3.279–281, trans. and ed. Wetherbee, 76–77 'Non secus et miles Phoebi ad loca pacta Mineruae/ Discendique lares properat, luctamine toto/ Et pedis et mentis.'

[38] 3.409–412, trans. and ed. Wetherbee (note 36) 82–83 'puer intrat Delia miles / Castra, recessurus dicta sumptaque salute, / Et dicto sumptoque "vale", temereque magistri / Praecipitatur honos.' See also 3.414, trans. and ed. Wetherbee (note 36) 84–85, 'Unschooled in armed warfare, he takes up arms and goes to war' ('Iamque in bella venit imbellis, inhermis in arma').

[39] 5.72–79, trans. and ed. Wetherbee (note 36) 120–121: 'Hic uulgus cathedras rapta deitate magistri / Insilit, et uacua de maiestate tumorem / Concipit impubis et mento et mente, uirenti / Crudus adhuc succo, iuuenem solidosque uiriles [75] / Praeueniens cul-

These complaints cut to the heart of the quandaries that the masters raised: the *puer senex* was a tried-and-true topos, but the reality of the *puer magister* was not so readily countenanced. Since the sort of mastery with which the *magistri* were concerned was a credential based solely on words, and since no formal degrees existed yet to certify command of them, the system threatened to collapse if unqualified young men, mere boys, claimed to be masters. In the case of mastery, name and reality were more intertwined than in any other art. If the one became debased, so did the other. Thus William of Conches (ca. 1080–1154) writes in the *Dragmaticon philosophiae* about the injury done to the authority of the master by students who in a year of dilettantism pick up only a smattering of learning and who are seen through quickly as ignoramuses by their parents or others, but whose shortcomings are nonetheless laid at the feet of their masters: 'And when they are heard by their parents or others, little or no use is found in their words, and at once it is believed that they acquired this from their masters alone; on this basis the authority of the master is diminished.'[40]

The rise of the master class raised an acute dilemma for an era which was obsessed with junctions and disjunctions between words and things as well as between words and deeds. As *magistri* fought over nominalism and realism, their own very existence tested their skills. For want of a structure or criteria to determine who would be a *magister* and who not, the *magister* himself became a crux, and masters had to debate in words to define mastery. The peculiarity is that the wisdom which stamps a person as being a master is a matter not of anything tangible, not even a piece of parchment such a degree, but purely of words. The oxymoron is that to be a master *in re* is impossible. The master who teaches, as opposed to the master carpenter or the like, can produce no physical masterpiece to demonstrate his mastery.

The usage of *magister* becomes regularized and circumscribed late in the twelfth century. The noun is coopted as an official title conferred by the authorities of the Church, which decree who pass muster as

---

mos, nec maturata senectae / Praecipiti lauro non expectasse ueretur. / Hos ego praetereo tacitos sine nomine, nosque / Praeterit ignotus insania nota magister.'

[40] William of Conches, *Dragmaticon Philosophiae*, Book 1, chapter 1, paragraph 3, lines 29–32, ed. I. Ronca, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 152 (Turnhout 1997) 4: 'Et cum a suis parentibus uel ab aliis audiuntur, in uerbis eorum parum uel nichil utilitatis perpenditur, statimque quod hoc solum a magistris acceperint creditur; unde magistri auctoritas minuitur.'

masters and thus who have permission to train students to become masters in turn.[41] Those who have obtained the degree and the license to teach (the *licentia docendi* that remains embedded in the terminology of degree-receiving in the Romance languages) are called *magistri*, a title that does not presume that they are authorities or even that they do or will actually teach. Those who have earned the right to teach but who choose to pursue another career are called *magistri* all the same.

The Prestige of the Title Magister

As the standing of the *magister* soared, the honorific became much coveted. To appreciate the glamour of being a master, one need look no further than comedies and satires. In the elegiac comedy *Geta* (ca. 1125–1130) by Vitalis of Blois (first half of twelfth century), the title character imagines the stature he will command among the kitchen staff of the household at home in France for having accompanied his lord to Athens, where the latter studied dialectic:

> … Samnio, Sanga, / and Davus will stand up to welcome Geta, / and the rest of the crowd will applaud their pal. / My name will grow longer. I'll be called / 'Master Geta'. My name's very shadow / will strike terror in all. / I'll be 'Geta the Great', venerated / by the whole kitchen crew. / I'll teach my servants great things.[42]

More than thirty years ago Astrik Gabriel expressed the wish that "there existed a 'mirror of Masters or Doctors,' a kind of *Speculum doctorum*, which would reflect the ideal portrait of the mediaeval master."[43] Although such a looking-glass may not lie within reach, we fortunately

---

[41] Duby, *The Three Orders* (note 11) 237: 'The word master was still suspect to Adalbero and Gerard, who applied it to heresiarchs, but during the mid-century it came to be used as a title conferred by the authorities of the Church, which selected teachers, issued credentials, and granted the license to educate students.'

[42] Lines 232–238 (English) in *Seven Medieval Latin Comedies*, trans. Alison Goddard Elliott, Garland Library of Medieval Literature Series B 20 (New York 1984) 36; lines 233–238 (Latin) ed. Ferruccio Bertini, *Commedie latine del XII e XIII secolo*, vol. 3, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di filologia classica e medievale dell'Università di Genova 68 (Genoa 1980): 'Assurgent Gete redeunti Sannio, Sanga, / Dauus et applaudet cetera turba comes. / Accrescet nomen michi: dicar Geta magister; / Terrebit cunctos nominis umbra mei. / Magnus et in tota uenerabilis ipse popina / Iam liber seruos magna docebo meos.'

[43] Gabriel A.L., "The Ideal Master of the Mediaeval University", *Catholic Historical Review* 60 (1974) 3.

possess its antithesis—the mirror-image of a mirror, as it were. In the *Speculum stultorum* or 'Mirror of Fools' the poet Nigel de Longchamps (also known as Nigel Wireker or Whiteacre and Nigel of Canterbury: ca. 1130–1200) details the ambition of his asinine antihero, archetype of the perpetual student, a kind of Donkey Don Quixote, to secure the title of master. In the most relevant section, the donkey Burnel imagines the elevation he will enjoy if only he can become 'Magister Burnellus' by pursuing a master's degree in Paris:

> And so, with another noun preceding my name, / I will be called Master Burnel in name at the same time as in reality. / If anyone should happen to call me Burnel without adding Master, / he will be a public enemy to me. / Therefore with the renowned reputation of my name preceding, / I will be followed as a public speaker without equal. / The senate will come out in the company of the people, / the commoners will rush out and will say, 'Behold, the master is here!'[44]

If anything, the title increases in value in succeeding centuries. In *The Summoner's Tale* Geoffrey Chaucer (ca. 1342–1400), whose application of the English equivalents to *magister* and *magisterium* have not yet been ground down in the ever-turning mill of Chaucerian scholarship, presents a dialogue between the lord and friar that juxtaposes master as a term for a person who holds a degree, as an antonym to servant, and as a description of the role Christ played for the disciples:

> 'Now, maister', quod this lord, 'I yow biseke' —
> 'No maister, sire', quod he, 'but servitour,
> Thogh I have had in scole that honour.
> God liketh nat that "raby" men us calle,
> Neither in market ne in youre large halle.'[45]

The allusion Chaucer makes to the Bible had occurred long before to authors in the twelfth century, who felt disquiet over the attachment budding intellectuals displayed for the prestige of being called a master. Take for example Raoul Ardent (Radulphus Ardens, twelfth century) on the verse in question (Matthew 23.8 'But be not you called Rabbi'):

---

[44] Nigel de Longchamps, *Speculum Stultorum*, lines 1205–1212, ed. J.H. Mozley – R.R. Raymo, University of California English Studies 18 (Berkeley 1960) 58 'Sicque, meum nomen alio praeunte, Magister / Burnellus dicar nomine reque simul. / Si quis Burnellum non addens forte Magistrum / Dixerit, ille mihi publicus hostis erit. / Nominis ergo mei fama praeeunte celebri, / Subsequar orator publicus, absque pari. / Obuius adveniet populo comitante senatus; / Plebs ruet et dicet, "Ecce Magister adest!"'

[45] *The Canterbury Tales* III (D) 2184–2188, in *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson, 3rd ed. (Boston 1987) 135.

It is one thing, my brothers, to be called 'rabbi', another to wish to be called it. To wish to be called 'rabbi' is always the mark of an ambitious and vainglorious man. In truth, to be so called is characteristic of the good as well as the bad. But it does no harm, and on the contrary is an advantage, for the good master to be called master. For when a good man hears himself called master, he understands from it the need imposed on him to be in reality what he is said to be in name. Hence he strives and toils in word and example to show himself a true master to others. But it harms the wrongful master if he is called master. For when he hears himself called master, he puts his confidence more in another than in himself, and then he is prompted not to improve himself but rather to become haughty.[46]

John of Salisbury (ca. 1115–1180), too, protests that the name (and garb) of a master do not suffice to make a person one.[47] Walter of Châtillon complains that the misuse of the title correlates to a deterioration in the quality of reading and lecturing (since reading, learning a lesson, and teaching a lesson by lecturing were almost inextricably related in the twelfth-century academic milieu): 'Books are now read only cursorily, and many abuse the name of *magister*.'[48]

The Complexity of the Bonds between Magister *and* Discipulus

Let us return to the donkey we tethered a moment ago. Since Burnel is truly a mere ass, he is able after all his studies to manage nothing more intelligent or articulate than a hee-haw. In real life medieval

---

[46] *Homilia* 39, Dominica decima octava post Trinitatem, "*Convenerunt Pharisaei in unum,*" ed. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 155, col. 2084B–C 'Aliud est, fratres mei, vocari, aliud velle vocari rabbi. Velle vocari rabbi, semper est ambitiosi et gloriosi: Vocari vero, est tam boni quam mali. Sed bono magistro non nocet vocari magistrum, imo prodest. Cum enim vir bonus audit se magistrum vocari, hinc intelligit necessitatem sibi indictam, ut quod dicitur nomine, sit et re. Hinc studet et laborat verbo et exemplo se verum magistrum aliis exhibere. Perverso vero magistro nocet, si vocetur magister. Nam cum audit se vocari magistrum, magis alii credit quam sibi, et inde instigatur, non ad seipsum corrigendum, [2084C] sed magis ad superbiendum.' The translation is mine, but my attention was called to the passage by Ferruolo S.C. *The Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and Their Critics, 1100–1215* (Stanford, California 1985) 233–234, who offers his own English version.

[47] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus maior* 1825, ed. J. van Laarhoven, vol. 1, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 17 (Leiden 1987) 225: 'Non facit, ut sapias, habitus nomenque magistri.'

[48] Poem 11. 14.1–2, ed. Strecker, *Moralisch-satirische Gedichte* (note 13) 115 'Superficie-tenus / libri nunc leguntur, // et magistri nomine / plures abutuntur'.

masters, although seldom confronted with flesh-and-blood donkeys in their classrooms, were exonerated of blame for having students too dull-witted to learn. Take for example these words, contained in the heavily twelfth-century *Glosa Victorina* on the two *Theological Tractates* on the Trinity by Boethius:

> Therefore, just as it is not the fault of the physician that a person who is sick does not recover health when a healer has employed his skill of healing, so too it will not be my fault if some fool should be unable to rise to the level of this exposition. If an instructor should teach a student less perceptive by [or 'in'?] the grace of the Word and the latter should not understand owing to dullness of wit, it will not be the fault of the master teaching but of the learner listening.[49]

Except when either party demonstrated such extreme incapacity, master and student were bound closely to each other; but even when teachers and students were matched well intellectually, the bond between them was intricate. Once again, Abelard offers fertile ground for exploration. In one instance he proposes (consistently enough with his own career as a gadfly to his masters) that students should not subscribe unthinkingly to the pronouncements of their masters. In a poem of gnomic wisdom addressed to his son Astralabe, Abelard seizes upon phraseology drawn from Horace. The Roman poet had espoused the principle that 'I am not bound over to swear as any master dictates'.[50] The Horatian dictum attracted no remark until Abelard, who in the *Carmen ad Astralabium* (157) advised his offspring: 'Don't swear on the words of a master who is beloved by you.'[51] Soon thereafter John of Salisbury applies the turn of phrase only slightly modified: 'Why in fact

---

[49] *Glossa Victorina* 33 (folio 98v) ed. N.M. Häring, *Commentaries on Boethius by Thierry of Chartres and His School*, Studies and Texts 20 (Toronto 1971) 536, lines 93–98 'Sicut ergo culpa medici non est quod infirmus adhibito medendi studio sanitatem non recipit ita etiam mea culpa non erit si insipiens quilibet ad hanc lectionem accedere nequiuerit. Uerbi gratia si quis doctor discipulum minus perspicacem instruat et ille sensus hebitudine non intellexerit culpa magistri docentis non erit sed discipuli audientis.'

[50] Horace, *Epistulae* 1.1.14, ed. and trans. H.R. Fairclough, Loeb Classical Library 194 (Cambridge, Mass. 1929) 251–253 'Nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri'. Fairclough points out that Horace here uses 'terms applicable to a gladiator, who took an oath to the master of his training-school.'

[51] Peter Abelard, *Carmen ad Astralabium* 9, ed. José M.A. Rubingh-Bosscher (Groningen 1987) 107 'Ne tibi dilecti jures in verba magistri.' This passage is the earliest medieval attestation of the proverb in the *Thesaurus Proverbiorum Medii Aevi*, 13 vols. and 'Quellenverzeichnis' (Berlin 1995–2002) vol. 7 (Berlin 1998) 337, 'Lehre' 8.2 'Auf die Worte des Lehrers schwören.'

does he doubt, who by swearing upon the words of his master pays heed not to what but by whom something is said?'[52]

Both Abelard and John urge their readers to hearken to the words of teachers rather than to the teachers themselves. This redirection of attention would seem inevitably to undercut the "authority" of the teacher. Yet Abelard's avowal of the necessity for students to question masters' words does not mean that he forfeited the right to command from his own followers a deference tantamount to what lords expected of vassals. Students who sought *studium* with a particular master were supposed to obey his *magisterium* and to receive and display the quality characteristic of their own obligations as disciples, namely, *disciplina.* For want of formal rules to govern masters and students, this discipline was sometimes wanting. The lack surfaces in a song (ten four-line stanzas, rhymed aaaa, with a French refrain) by Hilary of Orléans (flourished in the first half of the twelfth century), written when Abelard suspended lecturing because of ill behavior that had been alleged against his students.[53]

> [1] A servant's tongue, a traitorous tongue, / promoter of quarrel, seed of discord— / how vicious it is, we experience today, / by being subjected to a heavy penalty. / The master is in the wrong toward us. [2] A servant's tongue, our sundering, / has stirred against us the hate of Peter; / how it deserves a sword of vengeance, / because it has abolished our study. / The master is in the wrong toward us. [3] That peasant is to be loathed, / owing to whom the cleric leaves off schooling. / A heavy grief, that a certain man of the people / brought about that the logician should leave off [teaching]. / The master is in the wrong toward us. [4] It is to be grieved, that the tongue of a mere servant, / a cause of great jeopardy to us, / has whispered in the ear of one too credulous / and that owing to this his students leave off. / The master is in the wrong toward us. [5] O how hard I perceive the master to be, / if thanks to the report of his cowherd, / who is base and without value, / his lecturing should be denied us. / The master is in the wrong toward us. [6] Alas, how cruel is this report, / saying: "Brothers, go forth quite swiftly: / let us live in Quincy, / otherwise the monk will not lecture." / The master is in the wrong toward us. [7] Why, Hilary, why then do you hesi-

---

[52] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 7.9, ed. K.S.B. Keats-Rohan, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 118 (Turnhout 1993) 122: 'Quid enim dubitat qui iuratus in verba magistri non quid sed a quo quid dicatur attendit?'

[53] Evidently Hilary composed this song during the phase when Abelard was in residence at Quincy on the Ardusson near Nogent sur Seine; this was later the location of the oratory of the holy Paraclete, where Heloise was a nun. Apparently a peasant (Hilary calls him pejoratively a *rusticus*, *seruulus*, and *bubulcus*) had accused the students of misconduct.

tate? / Why do you not go away and live in the village? / But the short-
ness of the day, the long route, / and your weight restrain you. / The mas-
ter is in the wrong toward us. [8] From different places many of us
have come together, / where the greatest well of logic was located; / but
let the highest and the lowest be parted, / for what we sought here is
denied. / The master is in the wrong toward us. [9] A rumor about a font
of logic / drew us all together, far and wide: / look upon us, master, in our
desolation / and restore our hope, which is fading. / The master is in the
wrong toward us. [10] If through fraud, by mistake, / you wish to deny
us help, / the name of this place will be not / Oratory but Ploratory. / The
master is in the wrong toward us.[54]

Interpreting this song requires caution. One misconstruction to avoid
is anachronism: violence was done against the poem seventy-five years
ago, when an editor first characterized it as 'a college "hit"' and then
speculated that 'We can easily imagine the campus resounding with
these protesting lines sung by that large student-body.'[55] This transposi-
tion into the American collegiate world of the early twentieth century
may be unintentionally entertaining, but it hardly serves the goal of
verisimilitude.

Among other things the song conveys how much power rested in
the hands of the master. It is possible to look at the twelfth century

---

[54] Hilary of Orléans, 6 "Ad Petrum Abaelardum," ed. Walther Bulst and M.L. Bulst-
Thiele, *Hilarii Aurelianensis Versus et ludi. Epistolae. Ludus Danielis Belouacensis*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 16 (Leiden 1989) 30–31 (note: the inconsistency in the ending
of the final word in the refrain is thus in the edition): '[1] Lingua serui, lingua per-
fidie, / Rixe motus, semen discordie, / Quam sit praua, sentimus hodie / Subiacendo
graui sententie. / Tort a uers nos li mestres. [2] Lingua serui, nostrum discidium, / In
nos Petri commouit odium / Quam meretur ultorem gladium, / Quia nostrum exstinxit
studium. / Tort a uers nos li mestre. [3] Detestandus est ille rusticus, / Per quem cessat a
scola clericus. / Grauis dolor, quod quidam publicus / Id effecit, ut cesset logicus. / Tort
a uers nos li mestre. [4] Est dolendum, quod lingua seruuli, / Magni nobis causa peri-
culi, / Susurrauit in aurem creduli, / Per quod eius cessant discipuli. / Tort a uers nos
li mestre. [5] O quam durum magistrum sentio, / Si pro sui bubulci nuntio, / Qui
uilis est et sine pretio, / Sua nobis negetur lectio. / Tort a uers nos li mestre. [6] Heu
quam crudelis est iste nuntius, / Dicens: fratres, exite citius: / Habitetur uobis Quinci-
acus, / Alioquin non leget monacus. / Tort a uers nos li mestre. [7] Quid, Hilari, quid
ergo dubitas? / Cur non abis et uillam habitas? / Sed te tenet diei breuitas, / Iter longum
et tua grauitas. / Tort a uers nos li mestre. [8] Ex diuerso multi conuenimus, / Quo lo-
gices fons erat plurimus, / Sed discedat summus et minimus, / Nam negatur, quod hic
quesiuimus. / Tort a uers nos li mestre. [9] Nos in unum passim et publice / Traxit
aura torrentis logice: / Desolatos, magister, respice / Spemque nostram, que languet,
refice. / Tort a uers nos li mestre. [10] Per impostum, per deceptorium / Si negare uis
adiutorium, / Huius loci non Oratorium / Nomen erit, sed Ploratorium. / Tort a uers
nos li mestre.'

[55] *Hilarii versus et ludi*, ed. J.B. Fuller (New York 1929) 25.

as a heyday of freedom for the young, a 'buyer's market' in which students could forsake one master and pursue another as the whim struck them. Such a retrojection of footloose bohemianism upon the Middle Ages ignores the rights of masters to select their disciples, as are enunciated crisply in the prologue of the commentary of Thierry of Chartres (Thierry the Breton, died after 1149) on Cicero's *De inventione*:

> As Petronius says, we masters will be left alone in the schools if we do not stroke many and lay siege to their ears. But I do not behave thus. For so help me God I have exposed my words to the many for the sake of the few. Yet I have brought together my counsel in such a way that I would shut out the common crowd and the wanton herd of the school. For those feigning genius, by cursing at study, and those experts of home schooling, by counterfeiting a master, as well as those mimics of academic debate, armed for fights of empty words, such indeed follow my camp, but outside the palace—those whom the report alone of my name has brought down, so that in their regions they may counterfeit Thierry out of enthusiasm for treachery.[56]

Magistri *and* Auctores

The dominion of masters was most complicated and challenged when confronted by *auctores* of the texts they taught. For decades Orléans was the milieu most prominently associated with the exposition of authors.[57] Predictably, it was masters who taught these authors. In a comment

---

[56] Thierry of Chartres (Thierry the Breton, died after 1149), *Commentary on Cicero's* De inventione, *Prologue*, ed. K.M. Fredborg, Studies and Texts 84 (Toronto 1988) 49, lines 1–9 'Ut ait Petronius: nos magistri in scholis soli relinquemur nisi multos palpemus et insidias auribus fecerimus. Ego vero non ita. Nam medius fidius paucorum gratia multis mea prostitui. Sic tamen consilium meum contraxi, ut vulgus profanum et farraginem scholae petulcam excluderem. Nam simulatores ingenii exsecrando studium et professores domestici studii dissimulando magistrum, tum etiam scholasticae disputationis histriones inanium verborum pugnis armati, tales quidem mea castra sequuntur, sed extra palatium, quos sola nominis detulit aura mei, ut in partibus suis studio pellaciae Theodoricum mentiantur.' The passage cites, with interesting changes, Petronius, *Satyricon* 3.2, ed. and trans. M. Heseltine and E.H. Warmington (Cambridge, Mass. 1987) 6–7: 'Nil mirum ⟨si⟩ in his exercitationibus doctores peccant, qui necesse habent cum insanientibus furere. Nam nisi dixerint quae adulescentuli probent, ut ait Cicero, "soli in scholis relinquentur" […] eloquentiae magister […]' ('No wonder the teachers are to blame for these exhibitions. They are in a madhouse, and they must gibber. Unless they speak to the taste of their young masters "they will be left alone in the colleges", as Cicero says. [*Pro Caelio* 17.41.] […] A master of oratory […]').

[57] For several relevant passages, see Arnulf of Orléans, *Glosule super Lucanum*, ed. B.M. Marti, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome 18 (Rome 1958) xvi–xvii.

on Lucan's *De bello civili* Arnulf of Orléans (who flourished toward the end of the twelfth century) points out that it was 'our master Hilary' (no relation to the Hilary mentioned above) who as founding father of the local tradition initiated the study of the authors which was the art distinctive of Orléans:

> ETRUSCANS because [Tages] who first discovered the art of divination was from Etruria, on which basis too the people of that land have greater ability than others in that art, just as we Orléanais do so in the authors, from the founding father, our master Hilary.[58]

Masters who in bygone days would have contented themselves with expatiating upon authors now endeavored to devise expoundable texts of their own. The progression coincided, but not coincidentally, with the advent of teaching methods and intellectual preoccupations that compelled students to question what had been authoritative: authority no longer rendered authors immune to being interrogated. As authoritativeness became a quality that required proof, the prestige of masterliness ascended commensurately. Masters not only taught but also interpreted authors. And as masters mastered authors, they brought forth writings that authorized themselves.

Etymologically *auctor* was connected with a verb (*augeo*) meaning 'to increase' and cognate with wax (as in the waxing and waning of the moon). In the twelfth century, for one long spell, *magister*, with its base meaning of 'he who is greater', came to encompass greatness not only of stature but also of increase. Alongside master authors (such as Master Aesop), author masters took their places.

The cultural efflorescence to which the catchphrase 'Twelfth-Century Renaissance' has been attached included, not without controversy, an unprecedented responsiveness to new works by Medieval Latin authors—*moderni auctores* as distinct from *antiqui*.[59] Masters not only taught old classics but also composed new ones. Although it took a while for this openness to achieve lasting effects in the highly conservative lower reaches of grammar instruction, twelfth-century compositions eventually displaced old standbys from the curriculum.

---

[58] *Glosule super Lucanum*, Book 1, line 584, ed. Marti (note 56) 72: 'TUSCOS quia de Tuscia fuit qui primus artem aruspitii inuenit, unde et homines illius terre magis quam alii in illa ualent arte, sicut nos Aurelianenses in auctoribus a primo patre magistro nostro Hylario.'

[59] Ghisalberti A., "I moderni", in G. Cavallo – C. Leonardi – E. Menestò (eds.), *Lo Spazio Letterario del Medioevo. 1. Il Medioevo Latino, 1 La Produzione del testo* (Rome 1992) 605–631.

In the thirteenth century the school curriculum favored a set of six elementary Latin texts, all but one from antiquity and Late Antiquity. Conventionally designated the *Sex auctores* (not everything is as it sounds), this half dozen comprised the *Distichs of Cato*, *Eclogue of Theodulus*, fables of Avian, elegies of Maximian, Statius' *Achilleid*, and Claudian's *Rape of Proserpina*, with the last two texts sometimes in reverse order but with the others usually appearing in the progression just given.[60]

By the fourteenth century the *Distichs* and *Eclogue* remained in vogue, but the other texts of the *Sex auctores* were replaced for reasons of language, style, form, and content by Medieval Latin poems. Eventually the assemblage of texts became the *Auctores octo morales*, the progression of school texts which dominated from the beginning of the fourteenth century to the mid sixteenth.[61] The *Auctores octo morales* comprised the *Distichs of Cato*; the *Eclogue of Theodulus*; a twelfth-century book of manners, *Facetus*; a twelfth-century poem *On Contempt for the World* (often called *Chartula*); Matthew of Vendôme's (twelfth century) epyllion on the book of Tobit in the Vulgate Bible, *Tobias*; Alan of Lille's (d. 1203) *Proverbs*, as a complement to the proverbial wisdom of the *Distichs*; some sixty *Fables of Aesop* ascribed to a twelfth-century Gualterus Anglicus ('Walter the Englishman'); and a twelfth-century compendium of Christian dogma, *Floretus*. In succession, the *Sex auctores* and *Auctores octo* attained such predominance in basic education that to set up shop, an aspiring master of a grammar school would have needed only his own copies of them as well as of the standard grammar textbooks such as Alexander of Villedieu's (ca. 1170 – ca. 1250) *Doctrinale* and Evrard of Béthune's *Graecismus*.[62]

Among the *moderni* many newcomers had their day. In the loftier reaches of the curriculum many *moderni* from the twelfth century crafted new texts that were judged meritorious of the close reading and glossing that in earlier centuries had been lavished only upon much older texts. For example, Alan of Lille's *Anticlaudianus*, with its methodical

---

[60] Boas M., "De librorum catonianorum historia atque compositione", *Mnemosyne* N.S. 42 (1914) 17–46. For a table of changes, see Boas, 46. For a more recent study, with a list of manuscripts (most of them English) from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, see Clogan P.M., "Literary Genres in a Medieval Textbook", *Mediaevalia et humanistica* N.S. 11 (1982) 199–209.

[61] For an English translation of the whole, see Pepin R.E., *An English Translation of Auctores Octo, A Medieval Reader*, Mediaeval Studies 12 (Lewiston 1999).

[62] Orme N., *English Schools in the Middle Ages* (London 1973) 126.

overviews of the key names and concepts in the seven liberal arts and with its verbal map of the cosmos, elicited illustrations, commentaries, and glosses.[63] Walter of Châtillon's *Alexandreis* was also heavily glossed.[64]

The oft-invoked twelfth-century image of the dwarf on the shoulders of a giant pertained to the relationship not merely between moderns and ancients but also between masters and authors. In the late twelfth century the dwarf was in exceptionally strong fighting trim, willing not just to tweak the wax nose of authority but even to inscribe on wax tablets his own new compositions, ones destined to drive some of the classics out of the curriculum. Times when schoolmasters and college teachers hold sway are few and far between, but for the glorious nanosecond in life on earth that we call the Twelfth-Century Renaissance, the *magistri* were truly masters of their own destiny.

Select Bibliography

Primary Sources

ABELARD, Peter, *Carmen ad Astralabium*, ed. José M.A. Rubingh-Bosscher (Groningen 1987)

———, *Historia calamitatum*, ed. J. Monfrin (Paris 1979)

ARNULF OF ORLÉANS, *Glosule super Lucanum*, ed. B.M. Marti, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome 18 (Rome 1958)

BENEDICT OF NURSIA, *Benedicti regula*, ed. R. Hanslik, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 75 (Vienna 1960)

———, *The Rule of St. Benedict in English*, ed. T. Fry (Collegeville, Minnesota 1982)

BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, *Opera*, ed. J. Leclercq – H. Rochais, 9 vols. (Rome 1957–1977)

CARMINA BURANA, ed. O. Schumann – B. Bischoff, vol. 1, part 3 (Heidelberg 1970)

CHAUCER, Geoffrey, *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson, 3rd ed. (Boston 1987)

CHRÉTIEN DE TROYES, *Erec et Enide*, ed. M. Roques, Les romans de Chrétien de Troyes 1, Les classiques français du moyen âge 80 (Paris 1973)

———, *Cligés*, ed. A. Micha, Les romans de Chrétien de Troyes 2, Les classiques français du moyen âge 84 (1975)

---

[63] Meier C., "Die Rezeption des Anticlaudianus Alans von Lille in Textkommentierung und Illustration", in C. Meier – U. Ruberg (eds.), *Text und Bild. Aspekte des Zusammenwirkens zweier Künste* (Wiesbaden 1980) 408–548.

[64] Colker M.L., *Galteri de Castellione Alexandreis*, Thesaurus Mundi 17 (Padua 1978) XXIII–XXIV.

——, *Le Chevalier de la charrete*, ed. M. Roques, Les romans de Chrétien de Troyes 3, Les classiques français du moyen âge 86 (1972)

——, *Le Chevalier au Lion (Yvain)*, ed. M. Roques, Les romans de Chrétien de Troyes 4, Les classiques français du moyen âge 89 (1971)

——, *Le Conte du Graal (Perceval)*, ed. F. Lecoy, 2 vols., Les romans de Chrétien de Troyes 5–6, les classiques français du moyen âge 100 and 103 (1979–1981)

EPISTOLAE DUORUM AMANTIUM, ed. E. Könsgen, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 8 (Leiden 1974)

EVRARD OF BÉTHUNE, *Graecismus*, ed. J. Wrobel (1887, rept. Hildesheim 1987)

GLOSSA VICTORINA, ed. N.M. Häring, *Commentaries on Boethius by Thierry of Chartres and His School*, Studies and Texts 20 (Toronto 1971) 529–551

HORACE, *Satires, Epistles and Ars poetica*, ed. and trans. H.R. Fairclough, Loeb Classical Library 194 (Cambridge, Mass. 1929)

HUGUTIO OF PISA, *Derivationes*, ed. E. Cecchini, 2 vols. (Florence 2004)

JOHN OF HAUVILLA, *Architrenius*, trans. and ed. W. Wetherbee, Cambridge Medieval Classics 3 (Cambridge 1994)

JOHN OF SALISBURY, *Entheticus maior and Minor*, ed. J. van Laarhoven, 3 vols., Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 17 (Leiden 1987)

NIGEL DE LONGCHAMPS (Nigel Wireker or Whiteacre, Nigel of Canterbury), *Speculum Stultorum*, ed. J.H. Mozley – R.R. Raymo, University of California English Studies 18 (Berkeley 1960)

PAUL THE DEACON, *Epitome* of Sextus Pompeius Festus, *De verborum significatu*, ed. W.M. Lindsay (Leipzig 1913)

PAULUS, IULIUS, *Ad edictum libri LXXX* (in the *Digesta* of the *Corpus iuris civilis*), in *Palingenesia iuris civilis*, ed. O. Lenel, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1889; rept. Rome 2000) 1:951–1308

PETER THE VENERABLE, *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, ed. G. Constable, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass. 1967)

PETRONIUS, *Satyricon*, ed. and trans. M. Heseltine – E.H. Warmington (Cambridge, Mass. 1987)

RAOUL ARDENT (Radulphus Ardens), *Homilia 39: Dominica decima octava post Trinitatem, 'Convenerunt Pharisaei in unum'*, ed. J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 155, col. 2076D–2085A

THIERRY OF CHARTRES (Thierry the Breton), *Commentarius super Libros De inventione*, ed. K.M. Fredborg, Studies and Texts 84 (Toronto 1988) 45–215

VITALIS OF BLOIS, *Geta*, ed. Ferruccio Bertini, *Commedie latine del XII e XIII secolo*, vol. 3, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di filologia classica e medievale dell'Università di Genova 68 (Genoa 1980) 182–241

——, *Geta*, in *Seven Medieval Latin Comedies*, trans. Alison Goddard Elliott, Garland Library of Medieval Literature Series B 20 (New York 1984) 26–49

WALTER OF CHÂTILLON, *Moralisch-satirische Gedichte Walters von Chatillon aus deutschen, englischen, französischen und italienischen Handschriften*, ed. K. Strecker (Heidelberg 1929)

——, *Alexandreis*, ed. M.L. Colker, *Galteri de Castellione Alexandreis*, Thesaurus Mundi 17 (Padua 1978)

WILLIAM OF CONCHES, *Dragmaticon philosophiae*, ed. I. Ronca, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 152 (Turnhout 1997)

Secondary Literature

Boas M., "De librorum catonianorum historia atque compositione", *Mnemosyne*
   N.S. 42 (1914) 17–46
Clanchy M.T., *Abelard: A Medieval Life* (Oxford 1999)
Clogan P.M., "Literary Genres in a Medieval Textbook", *Mediaevalia et human-
   istica* N.S. 11 (1982) 199–209
Congar Y., "Bref histoire des formes du 'magistère' et de ses relations avec les
   docteurs'", *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 60 (1976) 99–112
——, "Histoire du mot *magisterium*", *Concilium: Revue internationale de théologie* 117
   (1976) 129–141
——, "Pour une histoire sèmantique du terme *magisterium*", *Revue des sciences
   philosophiques et théologiques* 60 (1976) 85–98
Duby G., *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chi-
   cago 1980)
Ernout A. and Meillet A., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des
   mots*, 4th ed. (Paris 2001)
Ferruolo S.C., *The Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and Their Critics,
   1100–1215* (Stanford, California 1985)
Gabriel A.L., "The Ideal Master of the Mediaeval University", *Catholic Histor-
   ical Review* 60 (1974) 1–40
Ghisalberti A., "I moderni", in G. Cavallo – C. Leonardi – E. Menestò (eds.),
   Lo Spazio Letterario del Medioevo 1, *Il Medioevo Latino 1*, *La Produzione del testo*
   (Rome 1992) 605–631
Godman P., *The Silent Masters: Latin Literature and Its Censors in the High Middle
   Ages* (Princeton 2000)
Haskins C.H., *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (Oxford 1929)
Jaeger C.S., *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval
   Europe, 950–1200* (Philadelphia 1994)
Le Goff J., *Intellectuals in the Middle Ages*, trans. T.L. Fagan (Cambridge, Mass.
   1993)
——, *Time, Work, and Culture in the Middle Ages*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago
   1980)
Lyme R.O.A., *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace* (Oxford 1980)
Marrou H.I., *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. G. Lamb (Madison,
   Wisconsin 1982)
Meier C., "Die Rezeption des Anticlaudianus Alans von Lille in Textkom-
   mentierung und Illustration", in C. Meier – U. Ruberg (eds.), *Text und Bild.
   Aspekte des Zusammenwirkens zweier Künste* (Wiesbaden 1980) 408–548
Orme N., *English Schools in the Middle Ages* (London 1973)
Pepin R.E., *An English Translation of Auctores Octo, A Medieval Reader*, Mediaeval
   Studies 12 (Lewiston 1999)
Steiner G., *Lessons of the Masters* (Cambridge, Mass. 2003)

Teeuwen M., *The Vocabulary of Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages*, CIVICIMA Etudes sur le vocabulaire intellectuel du moyen âge 10 (Turnhout 2003)

Watkins C., *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*, 2d ed. (Boston 2000)

Weijers O., *Terminologie des universités au XIIIe siècle*, Lessico intellettuale europeo 39 (Rome 1987)

HUMANIST RHETORIC IN THE RENAISSANCE: CLASSICAL MASTERY?

Marc van der Poel

In this contribution I present a few brief observations on the place of the art of rhetoric as a distinct discipline in the context of the history of Latin literature in the Renaissance. As a starting point I will take the view that the notions 'classicism' and 'modernism' take up a central position in our discussions on the continuity of Latin literature in the Golden Ages. In this context the notion of 'classicism' characterizes writings which follow classical models and attain mastership in this respect, while failing to be shaped in such a way as to be ready for use as a tool to confront contemporary demands. By contrast, 'modernism' refers to the main character of works that are considered to have reconquered, reshaped and reused the classical texts in order to actually meet the requirements for a role in the culture of their own time. I will argue that most intellectual and literary productions pertaining to the field of rhetoric in the Renaissance belong to the category of 'classicism'.

Rhetoric in the Renaissance is a vast topic. For my present purpose, it must be limited in two important ways. First of all, it goes without saying that I have not explored poetry nor literature in the vernacular in its relation to classical rhetoric, although both fields have contributed substantially to the character of the Renaissance. Secondly, the discussion of style in the Latin literature of the Renaissance, in particular of historical texts, philosophical texts and narrative texts, has been left aside completely. It is true that the style of Renaissance Latin texts can be studied in the light of classical stylistics, on the basis of the rules for *elocutio* (for instance by using the pseudo-Ciceronian *Ad Herennium* book 4, or H. Lausberg's *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*), but this does not imply that their authors were, either directly or indirectly, in effect influenced by classical rhetoric, in other words, that their authors thought of themselves as orators in action. In any event it is misleading to confine the study of the influence of classical rhetoric to stylistics,

although this narrowing down of rhetoric is precisely what happened in the course of time.

When we focus the discussion of classical rhetoric on the essence of the periods of so-called Golden Ages—namely the question whether or not, and if so, to what extent, the classics served as the standard of Latin literature in the Renaissance—we should first look at the theory (*ars*) of rhetoric and then at the category of Latin writings for which classical rhetoric served as the prescriptive example, namely forensic eloquence, deliberative eloquence and ceremonial eloquence (the three *genera causarum*). When we turn to this class of texts in the Renaissance, we immediately observe substantial differences with Antiquity.

In Antiquity, the practice of speaking in public existed long before its theory. Ancient theory describes in a well-organized way the rules and conventions which existed in practice. Handbooks were written to be used in schools of rhetoric, but training in such schools was not a goal in itself, but always a preparation for public speaking. In other words, there was a close entanglement between theory and practice of eloquence. The theory stemmed from the practice of public speaking and was continuously adapted to the practical needs of the orator. In this context it is useful to stress that there was not a single, monolithic body of theory that was operative during the entire period of classical Antiquity, a fact which is sometimes forgotten by modern students of rhetoric.

In the Renaissance the situation is quite different. Rhetoric came in the picture through education: Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* functioned as the main guidebook for the system and the programme of human-ist schools. The humanists restricted the medieval teaching material on the *artes sermocinales* (mainly theory of grammar and dialectic) consider-ably and concentrated on teaching both to speak Latin as a means of international communication and to write Latin prose and poetry, using classical literature as their model. This shift of focus brought along a major linguistic change. Scholastic Latin, which dominated when the humanist movement began, is a highly artificial language, geared to rationalistic discussions which followed a standard pattern (*disputationes*). The humanists for their part were interested in the living Latin of Antiquity, which not only appealed to reason, but also to feeling and emotion. Hence they were keenly interested in literary style and com-position. But if we look at rhetoric, we find that there was not actually a revival of classical rhetoric, in other words of public speaking, because the historical circumstances were completely different. The humanists

were duly aware of that fact, as the following passage from Erasmus'
(1466–1536) *Ciceronianus* (1528) illustrates:[1]

> Yet even if we allow that Cicero's eloquence served some purpose in
> its time, what use is there for it today? In the lawcourts? But the busi-
> ness there is all conducted by means of clauses and sections and legal
> terminology, by procurators and advocates who are anything but Cicero-
> nian, before adjudicators who would think Cicero a barbarian. There
> is not much more use for it in the council-chamber, where individuals
> put forward their views to a small group, and that's done in French or
> German. The most important business nowadays is carried out by privy
> council, attended by at most three men, usually of no great education;
> everyone else is merely informed of their decisions. Even if Latin were
> the language in which administration was carried out today, who would
> put up with Cicero orating his way through those speeches he delivered
> against Verres, Catiline, Clodius, Vatinius? What senate would have time
> and patience enough to endure the speeches he made against Antony,
> even allowing for the fact that he delivered these at a time when his
> style was showing signs of age and become less abundant and exuber-
> ant. So may I ask for what purpose are we going to use this Cicero-

---

[1] Erasmus D., *Ciceronianus*, ed. P. Mesnard, in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi* I, 2 (Ams-
terdam 1971) 654–655: 'Verum ut olim fuerit utilis eloquentia Ciceronis, hodie quis
est illius usus? An in iudiciis? Ibi res agitur articulis ac formulis, per procuratores et
advocatos quidvis potius quam Ciceronianos apud iudices, apud quos barbarus esset
Cicero. Neque multo maior usus in conciliis, ubi singuli paucis aperiunt quod videtur,
idque Gallice aut Germanice. Maximae vero res hodie per consilium quod arcanum
vocant conficiuntur; ad id vix tres homines adhibentur, illiterati fere, reliquis licet con-
sultare. Iam etiamsi res agerentur hodie Latine, quis ferret Ciceronem ea perorantem
quae dixit in Verrem, in Catilinam, in Clodium, in Vatinium testem? Quis senatus
tam ociosus, tam patiens, ut perpessurus sit orationes quas dixit in Antonium, quum
in his tamen senilior sit, minus redundans, minus exultans eloquentia? Itaque cui tan-
dem usui paramus hanc operosam Ciceronis eloquentiam? Num concionibus? Vulgus
Ciceronis linguam non intelligit, et apud populum nihil agitur de republica. Sacris
vero concionibus minime congruit hoc dicendi genus. Quis igitur superest usus, nisi
forte in legationibus, quae Romae praesertim Latine peraguntur, ex more magis quam
ex animo, et magnificentiae causa potius quam utilitatis gratia. In his enim nihil agi-
tur rei seriae, in laudibus eius ad quem mitteris, in testificatione benevolentiae illius
a quo mitteris, et in locis quibusdam vulgaribus consumitur omnis oratio. Quid mul-
tis? Totum hoc eius generis est, ut rem magnam praestiteris, si speciem adulationis
vitaris, cum ipsam adulationem non liceat. Frigidius [edition (wrongly): *Frigidus*] etiam
est, quod huic ex more respondetur, interdum non sine gravi taedio prolixae dictionis,
nonnumquam et pudore illius qui laudatur immodice, saepe dicentis non pudore tan-
tum sed et periculo, dum sudat recitans quae edidicit, dum haeret, dum sibi aliquoties
excidit vel oblivione vel animi perturbatione. Quid autem admirationis habeant tales
orationes, cum fere qui recitat ab rhetore quopiam elaboratam ediderit, ut ad ora-
torem nostrum nihil redeat laudis praeter recitandi fortitudinem? Hic itaque praeter
salutationis officium nihil agitur quod est serium, privatim literis et Gallicis colloquiis
peragitur.'

nian eloquence which costs so much effort to acquire? For addressing
the public? The public doesn't understand the language of Cicero, and
no matters of state are discussed with the public. For holy sermons this
style of oratory is quite unsuitable. So what use is there left for it, except
perhaps on diplomatic missions, which are conducted at Rome chiefly
in Latin, but from tradition rather than from conviction, and for cere-
mony rather than for any useful purpose? Practically nothing of a serious
nature is dealt with on such occasions: the whole speech is taken up
with the praises of the person to whom you are sent, and with protes-
tations of good will on the part of the person by whom you are sent,
and with a lot of platitudes. In short, the whole thing is of such a nature
that it is an achievement if you avoid the appearance of flattery, when
flattery itself is inevitable. The customary reply to this speech is even
more dull: it is sometimes heavily boring because the speaker goes on
at such length; occasionally it is also embarrassing to the man who is
being praised so immoderately, and embarassing as well as risky to the
speaker, when he gets into a sweat as he recites what he has learnt by
heart, or when he gets stuck, or when he loses the thread of what he
is saying, either because he has forgotten it or because he is nervous.
What admiration then should one have for such a speech, when the per-
former has usually learnt it off after some professional rhetorician has
worked it up and when our orator deserves no credit except for his firm
recitation? So nothing is done here except for the formal exchanges; the
serious business is dealt with in private, through letters and conversations
in French.[2]

An identical observation is made by Marcus Antonius Muretus (1526–
1585) in a speech delivered as an introduction to his course on Cicero's
Letters to Atticus at the university of Rome in 1582. He states that judi-
cial and deliberative rhetoric do not longer exist and that, apart from
academic speeches, sermons for the people and occasionally welcome
speeches or funeral speeches for rulers, the use of eloquence is almost
confined to the writing of letters. This is a remarkable testimony if
we consider that it comes from Rome, the city that fifty years ear-
lier was the center for a revival of the ancient culture of the spoken
word.

> Young listerers, if we hold to the truth, the use of eloquence has in its
> entirety practically disappeared, so that hardly a trace of it is left except
> in letter writing. It used to be lord and master in trials, it used to reign in
> political consultations, and usually the side that had obtained the more
> eloquent lawyer won the case.

---

[2] Translation based on Knott B., *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 28 (Toronto 1986)
405–406.

> 'But all of this has once been; now she is discarded,'
> as Catullus says about a pinnace (4, 25–26),
> 'and quietly retired.'

> Lawsuits, at least in Rome, are conducted in such a way, that there is no place whatsoever in them for eloquence. In consultations on important and grave issues attention is paid to what each person says, not how elegantly he says it. And this is entirely right, it is not possible to deny it; still, a vast field has thus been taken away from eloquent men. As if she has acquired exemption from offices on account of her old age, eloquence has been ordered to amuse herself with our scholarly and indeed toilsome discussions, with holy sermons which are preached before the ordinary people, and sometimes with ceremonies of thanksgiving held either in the presence of princes or to adorn their funerals. Thus, from the three well-known Aristotelian classes of eloquence, only the ceremonial kind is left, which used to be held in lowest esteem.[3]

Testimonies such as these illustrate that two of the three *genera causarum* have no part to play in Renaissance society at all, while the third one, the *genus demonstrativum*, was not very relevant in society. This *genus* comprises speeches at official gatherings of all kind and funeral speeches for high placed persons, but, as both Erasmus and Muretus point out, these were purely ornamental, lacking the meaningful social function of ceremonial speeches in ancient times, such as the yearly speech for the soldiers killed in battle in classical Athens or the funeral orations for deceased members of prominent families in ancient Rome. Erasmus emphasizes in the *Ciceronianus* moreover that the oral use of Latin as a diplomatic language was in fact confined to Rome. Elsewhere

---

[3] Muretus M.A., *Scripta selecta*, *vol. 1 Orationes, praefationes*, ed. J. Frey (Leipzig 1887) 176: 'Hodie, adolescentes, si verum amamus, omnis prope usus eloquentiae, praeterquam in scribendis epistolis, ita de medio sublatus est, ut nec vola nec vestigium appareat. Dominabatur olim in iudiciis, regnabat in consultationibus, vincebat fere ea caussa, quae eloquentiorem patronum nacta erat.

> Sed haec prius fuere: nunc recondita
> (ut de phaselo ait Catullus)
> Senet quiete.

Iudicia, Romae saltem, ita exercentur, ut in eis nullus plane locus eloquentiae sit. In deliberationibus de magnis et seriis rebus, quid quisque dicat, non quam ornate dicat, attenditur. Recte omnino: neque enim negari potest; sed tamen isto modo magna disertis hominibus subtracta materia est. Eloquentia, quasi aetatis beneficio immunitatem consecuta, jussa est oblectare se in his nostris scholasticis ac pulverulentis disputationibus, in sacris concionibus, quae ad populum habentur, & interdum in gratulationibus, quae fiunt ad principes aut in eorum funeribus exornandis. Ita ex illis tribus Aristotelis dicendi generibus solum epidicticon, quod olim minimi pretii habebatur, in usu relictum est.'

Latin was spoken as well, but not always in a way that contributed
to mutual understanding, as is illustrated by an anecdote in Erasmus'
De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione (1528) about Emperor Maxi-
milian listening to some speeches of welcome. One of the speakers was
a Frenchman, whose speech was written in good Latin by an Italian,
but it was delivered with such a strong French accent that the Italians
present thought the man was speaking French. The same thing hap-
pened with the speech delivered by the next speaker, a learned man
from the court, who was a German, followed by a Dane and a Zealan-
der: each spoke his Latin with such a heavy accent that it was unin-
telligible for most attendants of the ceremony.[4] Even the very limited
use of ceremonial eloquence within its social context had this fatal flaw,
and this held true even in Erasmus's time, the heyday of the humanist
movement in Europe. These testimonies thus show that the continu-
ity of classical oratory in the Renaissance was in fact to a large degree
non-existent.

Another historical fact contributed to limiting the scope of the revival
of classical rhetoric, namely the invention of printing. The printed book
contributed substantially to the development of eloquence into the art
of writing well rather than speaking well. Even speeches that were
composed for delivery, namely ceremonial speeches of all kinds (diplo-
matic, academic, valedictory, funeral and nuptial), were often printed
and exerted more influence in their printed form than as examples of
actual speeches. For instance the academic orations of Marcus Antonius
Muretus were often reprinted as model speeches until the nineteenth
century.

In spite of the fact that the role of public speeches was negligible,
there exists in the Renaissance an abundance of theories of eloquence,
mainly due to the fact that rhetoric was an important subject in the
Latin schools.[5] Most of these books are manuals in which the theory

---

[4] Erasmus D., *De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione*, ed. M. Cytowksa in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi* I, 4 (Amsterdam 1973) 100; trans. Pope M., *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 25 (Toronto 1985) 472–473.

[5] A useful survey of this large body of texts can be found in L.D. Green and J.J. Murphy (eds.), *Renaissance Rhetoric Short Title Catalogue, 1460–1700* (Aldershot 2006). For a survey of important authors and works see Van der Poel M., "Rhetorik. B. Ge-schichte. I. Quellengeschichte (wichtigste Autoren nach Epochen: bio-bibliographisch). 3. Frühe Neuzeit (15.-17.Jh.)", in G. Ueding (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, vol. 7 (Tübingen 2005) 1460–1468 = G. Ueding (ed.), *Rhetorik. Begriff, Geschichte, Internationalität* (Tübingen 2005) 25–30.

of eloquence is discussed according to the classical patterns of the five *officia oratoris*, the three *genera causarum*, and the four parts of the speech. These manuals vary widely in size and scope, ranging from basic surveys of key concepts, such as Cornelius Valerius' (1512–1578) *In universam bene dicendi rationem tabula* (first ed. 1569) to very detailed surveys and critical discussions of all available Greek and Latin sources like for instance Gerardus Johannes Vossius' (1577–1649) *Commentariorum rhetoricorum sive oratoriarum institutionum libri VI* (first ed. 1606). Towards the end of the Renaissance there seems to be a tendency to focus on *elocutio* to the detriment of the other tasks of the orator, especially in brief manuals for use in schools (e.g. Vossius' *Elementa rhetorica*, first published in 1616 with many reprints until the nineteenth century). This development illustrates the gradual constriction of the classical *ars dicendi* to stylistics, to which I referred in the introduction. Not many Renaissance handbooks of rhetoric have been published in modern editions (nor would there be any great use for such editions), but since they have been produced in such large numbers during the Renaissance, they are easily accessible in any research library in Europe.

Most Renaissance theorists of eloquence made little or no effort to interpret classical theory in the light of contemporary requirements. Some important efforts were made in the second half of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century, mainly in the Northern part of Europe. The works of Rudolph Agricola (1444–1485), Desiderius Erasmus, Juan Luis Vives (1492–1542), and Philippus Melanchthon (1497–1560) are of primary importance in this context.

Rudolph Agricola's *De inventione dialectica* (1479) discusses in great detail the theory of the *loci argumentorum*, which was an important subject in medieval dialectic; notwithstanding this focus (also apparent in the title), Agricola in fact gives an in-depth, highly original analysis of the entire process of persuasive communication, discussing formal arguments and their arrangement as well as the techniques to interlace arguments with affective appeals.[6] At the same time Agricola's work also illustrates the continuity of medieval dialectic. In *De conscribendis epistolis* (1522) Erasmus discusses, among other things, the three classical *genera causarum*, showing by means of examples how the techniques

---

[6] Agricola R., *De inventione dialectica libri tres, drei Bücher über die Inventio dialectica, auf der Grundlage der Edition von Alardus von Amsterdam (1539) kritisch herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*, ed. L. Mundt (Tübingen 1992). Mack P., *Renaissance Argument. Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic* (Leiden 1993).

of persuasion proper to each *genus* can be used in modern situations, especially in letter writing. Thus, the principles of the *genus iudiciale* are applied to letters of complaint. Erasmus further adapts the classical theory to contemporary needs by defining and discussing a separate category for letters on personal matters addressed to friends, the *genus familiare*.[7] Erasmus' friend Juan Luis Vives wrote several interesting treatises in which he discusses and, where necessary, modernises the art of persuasion in the light of contemporary needs, such as *De consultatione* (1523),[8] *De instrumento probabilitatis* (published as part of *De disciplinis*, 1531)[9] and *De ratione dicendi* (1532).[10] Vives does not slavishly follow the classical divisions and definitions, but uses classical (and in some cases medieval) elements to create a sort of new theoretical framework to discuss the practical requirements for persuasive writing. He seems to be rather an original thinker in the field of rhetorical theory, who has had little influence and whose work in this field is also neglected in modern scholarship. Finally, Philippus Melanchthon defined in his *Elementa rhetorices* (1519) a new *genus causae* specifically geared to explaining the Christian doctrine in sermons, namely the *genus didascalicum* or *didacticum*.[11]

In short, there exist two types of theories of rhetoric: those that follow closely the classical patterns and those that do not. In accordance with the positions taken in the introduction, the first type can be defined as 'classical', following the classical models, attaining mastership, but not shaped in such a way as to be ready for use as a tool to confront contemporary demands. The second type, comprising far fewer works, consists of the category of writings which display a sort of 'modernism.' In works such as those mentioned by Agricola, Erasmus, Vives and

---

[7] Erasmus D., *De conscribendis epistolis*, ed. J.-Cl. Margolin in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi* I, 2 (Amsterdam 1971) 331.

[8] Vives J.L., *De consultatione*, ed. G. Mayansius in *Joannis Ludovici Vivis Valentini Opera omnia*, vol. 2 (Valencia 1782, repr. London 1964) 238–262. Van der Poel M., "Observations on J.L. Vives's Theory of Deliberative Oratory in *De consultatione* (1523)", in A. Dalzell et al. (eds.), *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Torontonensis* (Binghamton–New York 1991) 803–811.

[9] Vives J.L., *De instrumento probabilitatis*, ed. G. Mayansius in *Joannis Ludovici Vivis Valentini Opera omnia*, vol. 3 (Valencia 1782, repr. London 1964) 82–120.

[10] Vives J.L., *De ratione dicendi*, ed. G. Mayansius in *Joannis Ludovici Vivis Valentini Opera omnia*, vol. 2 (note 8) 93–237. German translation, with a facsimile of the Mayansius edition, by A. Ott (Marburg 1993). Mack, P., "Vives's *De ratione dicendi*: Structure, Innovations, Problems", *Rhetorica* 23 (2005) 65–92.

[11] Melachthon Ph., *Elementa rhetorices*, ed. with translation and commentary by V. Wels (Berlin 2001).

Melanchton we find instances of reconquering, reshaping and reusing the classical texts in order to actually meet the requirements to play a role in the culture of their own time. These 'modern' works do not constitute a reaction to an earlier, imitative classicistic phase, as one might expect, but instead, they exist for a short period of time side by side with the classicistic works, and, in my view, give evidence of a true, meaningful reception of the classical texts. Later (probably from around the middle of the sixteenth century onward) this 'modern', relevant reception of the classical texts gradually comes to an end. The classicistic, imitative, bookish and rather academic reception of classical rhetoric holds the field and even has its heyday, especially in the schools of the Counter-Reformation.

A similar pattern of classicism versus modernism exists for the practice of rhetoric. On the one hand, there is a huge body of orations (both in print and in manuscript) delivered in an academic context or for ceremonial purposes, which display mere classicism, i.e. archaic imitation of the ancients, in which stock ideas are only rehearsed, bearing no relation to contemporary society.[12] Such orations were printed because they display classical mastership; those by the best Latinists were sometimes used as stylistic models, such as the aforementioned orations of Muretus from the end of the sixteenth century. A famous humanist from Erasmus' time who tried to equal the ancients in this classicistic manner is Christophorus Longolius (1488–1522) from the Southern Low Countries. He was a fanatical Ciceronian, who not only wrote in Cicero's style, but who also made himself felt as an orator in the circles of the Roman Academy. When he visited Rome in 1518, he composed and delivered five orations celebrating ancient Rome and hailing contemporary Rome as the centre of civilization.[13] Early 1519, the City Council of Rome proposed to award him the honorary title *civis Romanus* (citizen of Rome), which was granted to foreigners only in very exceptional cases. Their proposal offended several patriotic intellectuals and led to a trial conducted in the presence of Pope Leo X and the cardinals, in which the City Council's proposal finally prevailed.[14] For Erasmus, the notorious case of Longolius was a clear example of the

---

[12] See the categories 'Academic orations' and 'Occasional oratory' in IJsewijn J. – Sacré D., *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, vol. 2 (Leuven 1998) 172–177.

[13] The five orations survive in manuscript, see Simar Th., *Christophe de Longueil, humaniste (1488–1522)* (Louvain 1911) 56, note 2.

[14] See for details on Longolius' adventures in Rome Simar Th., *Christophe de Longueil* (note 13) chapters V and VI.

archaic and useless, in his eyes even pernicious revival of the classical, pagan world, which he opposed resolutely in many of his writings, most directly in the *Ciceronianus* (1528).

Within the huge, so far only partly explored body of ceremonial oratory produced between 1450 and 1650, there exists a number of speeches which do address contemporary issues and may be considered as a specific category between the 'classicistic' on the one hand and the 'modernist' on the other. Thus, there are ceremonial speeches in which their author uses the occasion to set forth his political ideas. A good example is Erasmus' *Panegyricus ad Philippum Austriae ducem.*[15] This is the official welcome speech delivered in the ducal palace of Brussels in 1503, when Philip the Fair returned to Brussels from Spain, written by Erasmus on demand, but in which he sets forth his ideas on the ideal prince. Another group of ceremonial speeches that may contain specimens with a political content are the orations delivered at the death of a pope, the opening of the Conclave, and, after the election, the so-called *Oboedientia*-speeches held by the ambassadors or their orators on behalf of kings and other public authorities.[16] There also exist academic orations, for instance delivered at the beginning of a course on a given classical text, which, far from being purely ornamental, discuss contemporary political matters either openly or obliquely. Thus, the Utrecht professor Antonius Aemilius (1589–1660) delivered several speeches at the beginning or the termination of a course on Tacitus' historical works (mainly the Annals), in which he speaks about Tacitus' works, but interlaces his argument with remarks on contemporary political issues.[17]

A completely distinct category of speeches are orations or declamations which were not written for oral delivery, but for circulation in manuscript form or for publication in print. A first group constitutes declamations on ancient historical subjects or famous persons, which at first sight seem to be merely rhetorical exercises, but by the choice of subject matter and the treatment thereof may be interpreted as disguised discussions of contemporary issues, especially of a political nature. Thus, like some ceremonial speeches, such declamations can

---

[15] Erasmus D., *Panegyricus ad Philippum Austriae ducem*, ed. O. Herding in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi* IV, 1 (Amsterdam 1974). Translation by B. Radice in *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 27 (Toronto 1986) 1–75.

[16] Here, I follow IJsewijn-Sacré, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* (note 12) 170.

[17] Van der Poel M., "Tacitus en het humanisme in Nederland", *Lampas. Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse classici* 5 (1991) 406–410.

also be categorized as partly 'classicistic' and partly 'modern.' Examples are the declamations on tyrannicide by Thomas More (1478–1535), written in response to Lucian's declamation in defence of a tyrannicide (*Tyrannicida*), or Vives's five *Declamationes Syllanae* (1520), in which Roman politicians argue both for and against the retention of power by the Roman dictator, whereas Sulla presents his abdication speech. More translated Lucian's declamation *Tyrannicida* and wrote his answer against it in 1506, a time when he was suffering from the displeasure of Henry VII on account of his opposition to a financial grant demanded by the King from Parliament; it has been suggested that his thoughts on the topic were inspired by his problems with the King.[18] Vives dedicated his *Declamationes Syllanae* (1520) to Ferdinand, Archduke of Austria (1503–1564). In his dedicatory epistle (par. 5), he stresses that his declamations offer political lessons to the young prince.[19]

Finally, there is a group of orations or declamations among the category of speeches not written for delivery but for publication in printed form only, which in my view can be counted as completely 'modern'. It consists of speeches which deal with topical issues in a straightforward, outspoken way. Their authors clearly had the ambition to practice the true rhetoric of Cicero and Quintilian, who attributed an important role to the public speaker in the civilian sphere. According to their well-known ideas, a good public speaker is an excellent and learned man (*vir bonus*) who acts as a responsible leader in the public areas proper to him: the legal, the ceremonial, and thirdly the broadest area, the deliberative, which, according to Quintilian (*Inst.* 3.8.14–15), not only includes true political eloquence but encompasses any subject one could ask or offer advice on. This ideology of the orator who puts his efforts at the service of the *res publica* is also characteristic of some humanists. They, too, see themselves as responsible, intellectual forefront thinkers within society (in their case, the *res publica Christiana*). When such a humanist takes up the pen to write a discourse adver-

---

[18] Campbell W.E., *Erasmus, Tyndale and More* (London 1949) 40. Thomas More translated Lucian's *Tyrannicida* and several other of his declamations in friendly competition with Erasmus. Edition of More's translation of the *Tyrannicida* and his own reply to it: More Th., *Translations of Lucian*, ed. C.R. Thompson in *The Yale Edition of the Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, vol. 3.1 (New Haven 1974) 79–127.

[19] Vives J.L., *Declamationes Syllanae, part one*, ed. E.V. George (Leiden 1989) 17. George E.V., "The *Sullan Declamations*: Vives' Intentions," in S.P. Revard et al. (eds.), *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Guelpherbytani: Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies* (Binghamton 1988) 55–61.

tised explicitly as rhetorical (*oratio, declamatio*, praise or another type of rhetorical argument), chances are he is offering his opinion on a matter he considers relevant to society as a whole and that he is presenting his viewpoint with particular assertion and conviction. To my knowledge, the best examples are:

1. Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457), with his argument that the so-called *Donatio Constantini*, Constantine's gift of worldly power to the popes of Rome, was based on a forgery: an *oratio*, but published in the early sixteenth century in Germany as a *declamatio*. In the introduction of his discourse Valla states that a speaker is only a real orator when he dares to speak his true mind: 'For the true orator must not be considered the man who knows how to speak well, unless he also dares to speak up.'[20] The discourse closes with a fierce attack on the Vatican.

2. The *Laus Neronis* by Hieronymus Cardanus (1501–1576) from the second half of the sixteenth century, a paradoxical praise, in which the author states assertively that he is led by his indignation (over the ignorance shown by the academic community in the art of government) to take a stand against the opinion which had prevailed over the centuries that Nero was the worst of Roman Caesars.[21] Cardanus' *Laus Neronis* is, in fact, a treatise on the art of government in disguise, as I have argued elsewhere.[22]

3. In Erasmus's numerous declamations on moral and pedagogical matters as well as political subjects, such as the *Encomium moriae*, *De pueris instituendis*, *Querela pacis*, and also the *Encomium matrimonii*, we find the assertive attitude of the *vir bonus dicendi peritus* as well. His declamations are highly committed writings, in which he not only criticizes conditions in society and within the church which he finds reprehensible, but in which he also sets forth his own ideas for a civilized Christian society, ideas that proved to be quite controversial indeed. In his letter to

---

[20] Valla L., *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione*, ed. W. Setz (Weimar 1976) 57: 'Neque enim is verus orator est habendus, qui bene scit dicere, nisi et dicere audeat'.

[21] Cardano G., *Neronis encomium*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Lyon 1663, reprint Stuttgart 1966) 180a; ed. with translation and commentary by N. Eberl (Frankfurt a.M. 1994) 30: 'Ergo sola rei indignitas me movit, cum, ut pleraque alia, optimum principem perverso ordine inter pessimos numerarent'. The quoted sentence concludes a passage (section 5 in Eberl's editon) in which Cardano argues that his essay is not an exercice in ingenuity.

[22] Van der Poel M., "Cardano's *Neronis encomium*: literary trifle or political treatise?", *Studi umanistici Piceni* 25 (2005) 283–291.

John Botzheim from 1523, Erasmus sums up the purpose of most of his declamations by stating that they *pertinent ad institutionem vitae* (that their purpose is to provide instruction in the proper way of living).[23]

4. Henricus Cornelius Agrippa of Nettesheim's (1486–1535) declamations in the form of general arguments (*theseis*), containing thoughts and considerations that were considered unacceptable by conservative theologians. The most famous declamation, *De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum et artium, atque excellentia verbi Dei declamatio* (1531), closes with a paradoxical praise of the donkey (chapter 102 of *De incertitudine*; Agrippa is speaking in this text about the donkey that carried Jesus on Palm Sunday and he uses it as a symbol to denote the anti-profane values of true Christianity; in other words: the animal that symbolizes stupidity is presented as the symbol of true wisdom). This writing was censured by conservative theologians because its author was suspected of defending Lutheran ideas.

I would argue that the group of orations and declamations by Valla, Erasmus, Agrippa and Cardano is the most classical precisely in that they are the most modern. They follow classical theory and put it into practice in a way that fits the circumstances of their own time. It is important to note that these writings date from the fifteenth century (Valla) and the earlier period of the Renaissance north of the Alps (roughly until the middle of the sixteenth century). My point is that, contrary to what one might expect, in the case of Renaissance rhetoric and eloquence 'modernism' does not follow 'classicism' in time, but conversely, 'classicism' follows 'modernism'. 'Modernism' should not be defined as a reaction to 'classicism'; rather, 'classicism' ought to be seen as a simplification, an enervation of modernism. Comparable to the situation in the early Roman Empire, the cause of this development is the establishment of a political or religious monarchy, or both in one, in most European countries, in which freedom of expression was not particularly welcome.

In the category of 'modernist' speeches the paradoxical praises comprise a very interesting subcategory: Erasmus' *Praise of Folly*, Agrippa's *Encomium asini* (chapter 102 of *De incertitudine*), Cardano's *Neronis enco-*

---

[23] Erasmus D., *Opus epistolarum*, vol. 1, ed. P.S. Allen (Oxford 1906, repr. 1992) 19. See on Erasmus' use of declamation Van der Poel M., "For freedom of opinion: Erasmus's defense of the *Encomium matrimonii*", *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 25 (2005) 1–17.

mium. The paradoxical encomium, in which the acumen of the orator is put to the test, was already in Antiquity a heterogeneous genre, ranging from sophistical set pieces to serious philosophical discourses. In the Renaissance it was very popular, in particular from the beginning of the seventeenth century onward. In this period several large collections of *ioco-seria* were published, the most famous of which is Caspar Dornavius' (1577–1632) *Amphitheatrum sapientiae socraticae joco-seriae* (1619). During this time and later, the serious paradoxes of Erasmus, Cardano and Agrippa (all three included in Dornavius' collection) were merely considered pieces of light reading, as is clear from the following statement by Daniel Morhof (1639–1691) on Caspar : 'There are many things here, which are useful for the honorable relaxation of the mind and which can be read with pleasure';[24] compare M. Radau, S.J. (1617–1687), who thus comments on the ioco-seria: 'But if someone were to write such things with serious intention, he would meet with laughter and the reproach of childishness on the part of sensible men.'[25] The fact that paradoxes that were intended by their authors as serious, committed discourses ended up being considered as texts to be read for entertainment of the highly educated and sophisticated élite, only clearly marks, in my view, the end of 'modernism' and illustrates the actual end of the true revival of classical rhetoric. What is left then, is the cultivation of elegant style in prose side by side with poetry. This tendency of the gradual confinement of rhetoric to stylistics is visible in many small seventeenth century surveys of rhetoric with a purely practical purpose, in which *elocutio* receives far more attention than the other tasks of the orator (e.g. Vossius' *Elementa rhetorica* of 1626). The manual of oratory *Ars dicendi* by the Jesuit Joseph Kleutgen (1811–1883), published twenty-one times between 1847 and 1928, illustrates how far this development eventually went: his companion to eloquence begins with a detailed description of style, then discusses prose genres and closes with the theory of poetry and prose writing (poetics and classical rhetoric).

A brief word on rhetoric and the sciences. When Nicolaus Copernicus (1473–1543) proposed his heliocentric system as an alternative to the geocentric system of Ptolemy, he was deeply aware of the profound

---

[24] Morhof D., *Polyhistor litterarius*, Book 1.21.45 (Lübeck 1747[4], reprint Aalen 1970) 246: 'Multa illic habentur, quae ad honestam animi relaxationem faciunt et cum voluptate legi possunt'.

[25] Radau M., *Orator extemporaneus* (Amsterdam 1651) 4: 'Ceterum si quis talia serio ageret, apud prudentes risum et puerilitatis notam incurreret'.

implications of his new theory for the teachings of the Church. Fearing persecution, he declined invitations to publish his work after its completion in 1536. After some time, he finally gave his work to his close friend Tiedeman Giese, who arranged for its publication in 1543. In the first edition, the work is preceded by Copernicus' dedication of the book to Pope Paul III. In this dedication Copernicus explains why he had the audacity to allow its publication, fully aware that it contradicted not only the *recepta opinio* of mathematicians but also common sense (*communis sensus*; I quote Copernicus's own words here).[26] The point he makes is that the geocentric system is not a scientifically established truth, but merely a theory (*opinio* of the mathematicians, as Copernicus says in the pasage referred to above; elsewhere he uses the term *incertitudo mathematicarum traditionum*, the uncertainty of the mathematical traditions;[27] the proper term in classical rhetoric would be a *dubium*), against which he defends his own opinion without claiming that it is the truth. With this approach he defends himself in advance against attacks from the church. His attitude is exactly the same as that of Erasmus and Agrippa when they were forced to defend their declamations against the censure of theologians. Like Erasmus and Agrippa, Copernicus adopts the attitude of an orator who courageously defends his opinion in an age of increasing religious intolerance. Copernicus' 'modernist' use of rhetorical strategy to allow himself the freedom to discuss publicly a controversial scientific issue, stands out in contrast to the categorical rejection of rhetoric by the Royal Society in 1660. The Society considered rhetoric to be nothing but 'volubility of tongue',[28] under the influence of the ideas of Francis Bacon (1561–1626), who thought rhetoric was merely an art of words. So in the field of the sciences too, we find that in time rhetoric came to be restricted to an area in which it could have no longer the important role it had in Antiquity and could perhaps have had in the Renaissance if the circumstances had been different.

Finally, there is one field in which spoken eloquence could have played an important role, namely sacred rhetoric. But sermons held for the congregation as part of religious services were both in the Catholic and in the Protestant world only delivered in the vernacu-

---

[26] Copernicus N., *Über die Kreisbewegungen der Weltkörper (De revolutionibus orbium caelestium) Erstes Buch*, ed. G. Klaus – A. Birkenmajer (Berlin 1959) 8.

[27] Copernicus N., *Über die Kreisbewegungen der Weltkörper* (note 26) 10.

[28] Purver M., *The Royal Society: Concept and Creation* (London 1967) 99–100 and 237.

lar languages. Latin sermons and collections of sermons were published in the Catholic world, but often these were translated from the vernacular for the benefit of an international audience. It is clear from the Latin handbooks of sacred oratory that a preference for affective preaching developed in the course of the sixteenth century.[29] This development seems to fit with the particular manner in which both Catholic and Protestant Church leaders tried to influence the way faith was absorbed by their congregations by means of fear on the one hand and the promise of eternal salvation on the other. Among the many theories of sacred oratory that were written during the Renaissance, Erasmus's *Ecclesiastes* (1535) is remarkable, because it consistently adapts the ancient theory of profane eloquence to the needs of the Catholic preacher, but it was never used as a guide for the actual practice of preaching. This does not need to surprise us because, as Erasmus himself says in the *Ciceronianus*,[30] classical eloquence did not match the way of preaching in his time. In the *Ecclesiastes*, Erasmus stresses that the preacher needs to have an excellent knowledge of the vernacular language and the idiom used by the people in his congregation.[31]

In conclusion: In the Renaissance, there is an abundance both of theories of rhetoric following the classical model and of orations, albeit only the epideictic kind. This abundance constitutes a clear break with the preceding phase (the late Middle Ages). However, the fruit yielded by this large body of theoretical writing is very limited: there are very few orations that deal with the great (socio-economic and political) problems which confronted society at the time, in particular the process of the consolidation of the absolute powers in Europe and the developments which led to the wars of religion, in which politics became inextricably bound up with religion.

It is an interesting question why true rhetoric and oral eloquence suffered such a dramatic decline precisely during an era that attached such great importance to language. Some factors which may have contributed to this development are the following: 1. the art of printing, 2. the rise of a class of citizens who are literate, but for whom it was not a matter of course to read Latin, 3. the increasing intolerance in

---

[29] Shuger D., *Sacred Rhetoric: The Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance* (Princeton 1988); see also Shuger D., "Sacred Rhetoric in the Renaissance", in H.F. Plett (ed.), *Renaissance-Rhetorik, Renaissance Rhetoric* (Berlin–New York 1993) 121–142.

[30] See supra note 1.

[31] Erasmus D., *Ecclesiastes*, ed. J. Chomarat in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi* V, 4 (Amsterdam 1991) 262.

matters of religion (and politics) since the beginning of the Reformation. The efforts of Erasmus and others to stimulate learned debate on matters concerning or related to religion failed due to the increasing athmosphere of intolerance which developed in the wake of Luther's appearance and the increasing necessity to choose sides without leaving room for any kind of exchange of opinions with the other side.[32]

Select Bibliography

Primary sources

Agricola R., *De inventione dialectica libri tres, drei Bücher über die Inventio dialectica, auf der Grundlage der Edition von Alardus von Amsterdam (1539) kritisch herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*, ed. L. Mundt (Tübingen 1992)

Cardano G., *Neronis encomium*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Lyon 1663, reprint Stuttgart 1966)

——, *Neronis encomium*, ed., trans. and comm. N. Eberl (Frankfurt a.M. 1994)

Copernicus N., *Über die Kreisbewegungen der Weltkörper (De revolutionibus orbium caelestium) Erstes Buch*, ed. G. Klaus – A. Birkenmajer (Berlin 1959)

Erasmus D., *Dialogus Ciceronianus*, ed. P. Mesnard in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi* I. 2 (Amsterdam 1971)

——, *The Ciceronian: A dialogue on the ideal Latin style*, trans. by B. Knott in *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 28 (Toronto 1986)

——, *De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione dialogus*, ed. M. Cytowksa in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi* I. 4 (Amsterdam 1973)

——, *The right way of speaking Latin and Greek: A dialogue*, trans. by M. Pope in *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 26 (Toronto 1985)

——, *De conscribendis epistolis*, ed. J.-Cl. Margolin in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi* I. 2 (Amsterdam 1971)

——, *On the writing of letters*, trans. by Ch. Fantazzi in *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 25 (Toronto 1985)

——, *Panegyricus ad Philippum Austriae ducem*, ed. O. Herding in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi* IV. 1 (Amsterdam 1974)

——, *Panegyric for Archduke Philip of Austria*, trans. by B. Radice in *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 27 (Toronto 1986)

——, *Ecclesiastes (libri I–II)*, ed. J. Chomarat in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi* V. 4 (Amsterdam 1991)

——, *Opus epistolarum*, vol. 1, ed. P.S. Allen (Oxford 1906, repr. 1992)

Melanchthon Ph., *Elementa rhetorices, Grundbegriffe der Rhetorik*, ed., trans. and comm. by V. Wels (Berlin 2001)

---

[32] I wish to thank Dr. P. Tuynman for his valuable comments on the draft version of this paper.

Muretus M.A., *Scripta selecta, vol. 1: Orationes, praefationes*, ed. J. Frey (Leipzig 1887)

More Th., *Translations of Lucian*, ed. C.R. Thompson in *The Yale Edition of the Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, vol. 3, part 1 (New Haven 1974)

Radau M., *Orator extemporaneus* (Amsterdam 1651)

Valla L., *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione*, ed. W. Setz (Weimar 1976)

Vives J.L., *De consultatione*, ed. G. Mayansius in *Joannis Ludovici Vivis Valentini Opera omnia*, vol. 2 (Valencia 1782, repr. London 1964)

——, *De instrumento probabilitatis*, ed. G. Mayansius in *Joannis Ludovici Vivis Valentini Opera omnia*, vol. 3 (Valencia 1782, repr. London 1964)

——, *De ratione dicendi*, ed. G. Mayansius in *Joannis Ludovici Vivis Valentini Opera omnia*, vol. 2 (Valencia 1782, repr. London 1964)

——, *De ratione dicendi*: *lateinisch/deutsch*, trans. by A. Ott (Marburg 1993)

——, *Declamationes Syllanae, part one*, ed. E.V. George (Leiden 1989)

Vossius G.J., *Commentariorum rhetoricorum sive oratoriarum institutionum libri VI* (Leiden 1606; Marburg 1681[5])

——, *Elementa rhetorica* (Leiden 1626; last ed. Leiden 1818)

Secondary sources and major critical works

Campbell W.E., *Erasmus, Tyndale and More* (London 1949)

George E.V., "The *Sullan Declamations*: Vives' Intentions", in S.P. Revard et al. (eds.), *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Guelpherbytani: Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies* (Binghamton–New York 1988) 55–61

Mack P., *Renaissance Argument. Valla and Agricola in the traditions of rhetoric and dialectic* (Leiden 1993)

——, "Vives's *De ratione dicendi*: Structure, Innovations, Problems", *Rhetorica* 23 (2005) 65–92

Morhof D., *Polyhistor litterarius* (Lübeck 1747[4], Aalen 1970)

Plett H.F. (ed.), *Renaissance-Rhetorik, Renaissance Rhetoric* (Berlin–New York 1993)

Purver M., *The Royal Society: Concept and Creation* (London 1967)

Shuger D., *Sacred Rhetoric: The Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance* (Princeton 1988)

Simar Th., *Christophe de Longueil, humaniste (1488–1522)* (Louvain 1911)

Van der Poel M., "Observations on J.L. Vives's Theory of Deliberative Oratory in *De consultatione* (1523)", in A. Dalzell et al. (eds.), *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Torontonensis* (Binghamton–New York 1991) 803–811

——, "Tacitus en het humanisme in Nederland", *Lampas. Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse classici* 5 (1991) 400–415

——, "Cardano's *Neronis encomium*: literary trifle or political treatise?", *Studi umanistici Piceni* 25 (2005) 283–291

——, "For freedom of opinion: Erasmus's defense of the *Encomium matrimonii*", *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 25 (2005) 1–17

——, "Rhetorik. B. Geschichte. I. Quellengeschichte (wichtigste Autoren nach Epochen: bio-bibliographisch). 3. Frühe Neuzeit (15.-17. Jh.)", in G.

Ueding (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, vol. 7 (Tübingen 2005) 1460–1468 = G. Ueding (ed.), *Rhetorik. Begriff, Geschichte, Internationalität* (Tübingen 2005) 25–30

IJSEWIJN J. – SACRÉ D., *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, vol. 2 (Leuven 1998)

PART IV

TRANSITIONS?

BRINGING UP THE REAR:
CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN THE
LATIN POETRY OF LATE ANTIQUITY

MICHAEL ROBERTS

The Latin literature of Late Antiquity is abundant and diverse. The period was one of generic innovation and experimentation in which a changed conceptual world gave rise to correspondingly new forms of expression. Most evidently, in Latin prose the didactic and rhetorical needs of the Christian teacher and community produced a range of different forms: for example, works of apologetic, polemical, anti-heretical treatises, sermons, biblical commentaries, ascetic treatises and hagiography. The centrality of a sacred text, the different aesthetic of Judaeo-Christian scriptures and their different exegetic techniques lent patristic writings qualities not easily paralleled in classical authors. At the same time, all these Christian authors had received the standard education in grammar and rhetoric (there was no other until the very end of the period). With it they acquired a sophisticated array of exegetical and discursive skills: techniques of textual analysis and explanation, a diverse arsenal of strategies, both structural and stylistic, for effective expression, and an understanding of how to achieve persuasion, attuned to audience and discursive context. They also acquired a regard for the canonical authors studied in the schools and for classical literary forms, as well as for the values Rome claimed to stand for, as embodied in exemplary figures from history and legend. Christian authors varied in their attitudes to this cultural legacy. Individuals might change their minds during the course of their lives or prove more accepting in fact than in theory, but all were shaped to some degree by the categories and practices learnt in the schools.

In this article I will limit myself to one specific area of late Latin literary production, that of poetry. It is a form of literature that makes an especially interesting test case for questions of continuity and change in Late Antiquity. Writing poetry was a high-status activity, a badge of cultural standing, that conveyed, in differing degrees depending on

the genre, prestige on the writer and potentially on his subject. That prestige depended in part on a perceived affinity to the great authors of the classical period, especially Vergil. On the other hand, for some Christians at least, poetry could be suspect. Its very charm, to which many writers of the period attest, combined with its often doctrinally suspect subject matter, rendered it a Siren-song, best avoided by the pious.[1]

In what follows I will trace some of the tensions at work here as they play themselves out in Late Antiquity. My paper is framed by two poets from the period, both of whom have been described as 'the last classical poet,' Claudian, at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, and Venantius Fortunatus, second half of the sixth century.[2] The wording suggests in each case a perceived break from the classical past. Examination of this perception, first in the case of Claudian, will provide an approach to issues of continuity and discontinuity in Late Antiquity.

What, then, came to an end with Claudian? The literary historians give no clear answer. In part it seems that in style, meter, and subject matter the poems of Claudian are approachable for readers familiar with the poetry of the Augustan era and the first century C.E. in a way that the work of his contemporaries or of later poets is not. Undoubtedly the absence of Christian content in Claudian's poems (with the exception of the brief *De Salvatore*) contributed to this judgement. As Averil Cameron has observed, the classical has often been defined by opposition to the Christian.[3] While the prejudice against Christianity as an irrational Eastern religion, alien to the classical world, is in full retreat, the effect of this view still lingers in the habit of excluding Christian authors from what is considered Roman. So Schanz-Hosius' influential literary history, now in the process of being replaced, divided the authors of Late Antiquity into the national and the Christian, thus incidentally creating problems of classification for writers like Sidonius

---

[1] Paulinus of Nola, *Epistula* 16. 7: 'Sirenarum carmina blandimentorum nocentium cantus evita.'

[2] Hadas M., *A History of Latin Literature* (New York 1952) 388: 'Claudius Claudianus … may fairly be called the last poet of classical Rome'; Browning R., "Poetry", in E.J. Kenney (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. 2. (Cambridge 1982) 706: 'Claudian … has often, and not unreasonably, been described as the last classical poet of Rome.' For further references see Fo A., *Studi sulla tecnica poetica di Claudiano* (Catania 1982) 19–20.

[3] Cameron Av., *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley 1991) 24–26.

and Dracontius, who wrote on secular and Christian subjects.[4] More recently Conte has drawn attention to Claudian's frequent association with Rutilius Namatianus as last poets of the empire.[5] In that case the association perhaps owes something to the rough synchronicity of their poems with especially dramatic events in the history of the western Roman empire, the invasion and occupation of parts of Gaul by Germanic tribes and the fall of Rome to the Visigoths in 410. No doubt, too, the prominence of Rome and its praise in the two poets contributed to the association of the two, although the strain of Roman nationalism is equally as strong in the Christian poet Prudentius, especially in the *Contra Symmachum* and *Peristephanon* 2.

Claudian's composition of a mythological epic on a traditional theme (the *De raptu Proserpinae*), however incomplete the work is, reinforces his claim to classical status. His is the last multi-book poem of Antiquity written in Latin on mythological subject matter. Sometimes he is paired with the later Greek author Nonnus: both Egyptian and both authors of mythological epic (in Nonnus' case the massive *Dionysiaca*).[6] Certainly my impression is that because of its familiar subject matter and genre for classicists the *De raptu* is the most accessible of Claudian's poems. So Alessandro Barchiesi, in an article on Kroll's notion of the 'crossing of genres,' confines his discussion mainly to the Augustan period. In a footnote near the end of the paper, though, he calls for a 'broadening of our sources' and the inclusion of Late Antiquity, citing 'recent work on authors like Claudian and Nonnos.'[7] The pairing is revealing. I suspect he has in mind their mythological epics, not, for instance, the Paraphrase of John's Gospel, now generally accepted as the work of the Greek poet. In fact, Late Antiquity is a period of great generic fluidity

---

[4] See Fontaine J., "Christentum ist auch Antike: einige Überlegungen zu Bildung und Literatur in der lateinischen Spätantike", *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 25 (1982) 6. Raby F.J.E., *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (2nd ed., Oxford 1957), 1:96, is unusually explicit: 'Claudian is really the last poet of the heathen world.'

[5] Conte G.B., *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. J.B. Solodow (Baltimore 1994) 706, and Conte G.B., "Die Literatur der Kaiserzeit", in F. Graf (ed.), *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie* (Stuttgart 1997) 293. Although he points out differences between the two poets he does not entirely dismiss the association. His section on Rutilius Namatianus in the later volume is headed "Der letzte Dichter: Rutilius Namatianus".

[6] Teuffel W.S., *History of Roman Literature*, 2 vols., trans. G.C.W. Warr (Cambridge 1900) 2:423: 'Claudian and Nonnos were the last important poets of Latin and Greek literature.'

[7] Barchiesi A., "The Crossing", in S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature* (Oxford 2001) 162, n. 39.

that does not lend itself easily to analysis according to the criteria typically applied to classical poetry. Attention to the full range of late Latin poetry is more likely to complicate than clarify such questions of genre.

Finally, Claudian is sometimes described as the last important Roman poet, thereby admitting the existence of later poetry but minimizing its value.[8] Again the criteria of judgement are not clear, but they presumably include both the quantity and quality of Claudian's works. To the classically minded critic it is typically the features Claudian shares with the poets of the Augustan age and the Early Empire that are valued, and that can seem largely absent in his successors. From this perspective Claudian is an epigone, writing when 'the national literature of Rome is hurrying to an end.'[9] But such an angle of vision runs the risk of being blind to certain typically late antique features of his poetry or of interpreting them according to anachronistic or inappropriate standards that ignore the cultural context and implicit poetics that make Claudian a poet of his time.

In fact, despite occasional dated judgements in literary histories, Claudian is now typically seen in the larger context of Late Antiquity. Far from being a last outpost of classical poetry, Claudian is a central figure in the history of late Latin literature. It is symptomatic that his epithalamium for the marriage of the emperor Honorius to Maria, the daughter of his patron Stilicho, both calls on the first-century precedent of Statius' epithalamium for Stella and Violentilla (*Silvae* 1.2) and itself was to be exemplary for the similar poems of Sidonius (*Carmina* 11 and 15), Ennodius (*Carmen* 388),[10] and Venantius Fortunatus (*Carmen* 6.1). Similarly his verse panegyrics have no close classical predecessor, yet were imitated in fifth-century Gaul by Merobaudes and Sidonius.[11] Claudian's close affinities with Vergil, Ovid, and the poets of the first

---

[8] Schanz M., *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinians*, 4 vols. in 5, rev. ed. C. Hosius – G. Krüger (Munich 1914–1935) 4. 2. 3; Teuffel, *History of Roman Literature* (note 6) 2:423.

[9] Schanz–Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (note 8) 4. 2:29. Pierre Grimal ends the final chapter of his literary history, entitled "Les Épigones", with Claudian as the last voice of the pagan mythological world view (*La littérature latine* [Paris 1994] 525).

[10] Ennodius, *Opera*, ed. F. Vogel, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Auctores Antiquissimi VII (Berlin 1885) 276–279.

[11] Lucan and Statius wrote panegyric poetry on Nero and Domitian, but only four lines of the latter's poem on Domitian's German war survive. The *Laus Messallae* and *Laus Pisonis* also are praise-poems, but lack the extended narratives or personifications characteristic of Claudian.

century are not unique to him. These are the poets most influential
on all late Latin poetry. In matters of composition and style the often
observed reduction of narrative sequence to a slim thread and the
complementary emphasis on descriptive passages and speeches (espe-
cially *ethopoiiae*), not just in Claudian's mythological poetry but in all
his longer poems, is characteristic of late Latin poetry as a whole.[12]
The same observations can be made of Alcimus Avitus' account (late
fifth century) of the Crossing of the Red Sea (*De spiritalis historiae gestis*,
book 5) or Venantius Fortunatus' of the Visigothic princess Galswintha's
journey to Gaul and subsequent death (*Carmen* 6.5).[13] Finally the cir-
cumstances of production and reception of Claudian's poetry are dis-
tinctly late antique. He writes for a powerful patron at court and his
poems are intended for recitation in a public, ceremonial setting before
an elite audience. In classical literature some poems of the *Silvae* written
in honor of the emperor Domitian furnish the closest parallel (e.g., 4.1,
on the consulship of Domitian). In subsequent poetry the panegyrics
of Merobaudes and Sidonius presuppose a similar context, while even
the small-scale praise-poems of Fortunatus are written for recitation in
a ceremonial setting, for instance a banquet, in honor of his patron.
On the Christian side Paulinus of Nola wrote his *Natalicia* to celebrate
the feast day of his patron, Saint Felix, and presented them in public
before the assembled company on that day and Arator publicly read
his *Historia apostolica*, a biblical epic based on Acts, containing praise of
the apostles and Roman martyrs, Peter and Paul, to great acclaim on
the steps of the church of St. Peter ad vincula in 544 C.E.

   The case of Claudian illustrates the elusive and often unsatisfactory
nature of literary periodization. His *De raptu* marks a benchmark of
sorts. For the student of classical Latin literature this makes him a
significant figure in the line that extends from Vergil, through Ovid and
the Flavian epics of Valerius Flaccus and Statius. But the narrative of
literary history varies depending on which threads historians choose to
follow and what periods they choose to privilege. Do we view Claudian

---

[12] See Mehmel F., *Virgil und Apollonius Rhodius: Untersuchungen über die Zeitvorstellung in
der antiken epischen Erzählung* (Hamburg 1940) 99–132; Cameron A., *Claudian: Poetry and
Propaganda in the Court of Honorius* (Oxford 1970) 260–273, and Fo, *Studi* (note 2) 105–123.

[13] See Roberts M., "Rhetoric and Poetic Imitation in Avitus' Account of the Cross-
ing of the Red Sea ('De Spiritalis Historiae Gestis' 5. 371–702)", *Traditio* 39 (1983) 29–62
and Roberts M., "Venantius Fortunatus' Elegy on the Death of Galswintha (*Carm.* 6.
5)", in R.W. Mathisen – D. Shanzer (eds.), *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul: Revisiting
the Sources* (Aldershot 2001) 298–312.

as a chapter in the history of classical epic or, for instance, of the Greco-Roman verse panegyric? In the latter case he will seem not the last figure in the line but an important transmitter of continuity and source of innovation.

For the student of Latin poetry the third century marks a critical watershed. For most of the century the pickings are slim. Little that can be securely dated and what does survive, often in fragmentary form, seeking its inspiration not in poets of the Augustan period or later but in Roman poetry of the Republican period. According to Alan Cameron this represents a kind of Latin archaism corresponding to the archaizing trend in Greek literature of the period.[14] The situation changes with the *Cynegetica* of Nemesian in 283/4. With it poetry emerges once more on the public stage as Nemesian promises to sing the martial triumphs of the young emperors Carinus and Numerian (*Cynegetica* 63–85). Presumably he intended a historical epic to complement his didactic and pastoral poems and to complete the Vergilian pattern. (Numerian died within a year and, as far as we know, the project was not completed.) Under Constantine poetry continues to play a role in the political arena. Optatianus Porfyrius sends his figure poems to the emperor in a successful attempt to secure his return from exile, the anonymous author of the Christian *Laudes Domini* ends his work with a prayer for Constantine, and Juvencus' four-book gospel epic concludes with praise of the emperor (*Evangeliarum Libri* 4. 806–812) that echoes the language Vergil uses of Augustus at the end of the *Georgics* (4. 560–562).[15] In his turn to the poets of the Augustan era and the first century Nemesian breaks with the archaizing tendency of second- and third-century poetry and sets the model for a classicizing trend that was to continue throughout the poetry of Late Antiquity.

Various threads can be followed through the literary history of Late Antiquity, according, for instance, to genre, subject matter, or confessional status of the author. Throughout the period poets show a pronounced delight in verbal play and patterning. The late Reinhart Herzog wrote of a retreat from realism in this period, but in their most

---

[14] Cameron A., "*Poetae Novelli*", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 84 (1980) 164–165.

[15] Roberts M., "Vergil and the Gospels: The *Evangeliorum Libri IV* of Juvencus", in R. Rees (ed.), *Romane Memento: Vergil in the Fourth Century* (London 2004) 48–49. Later in the century a very different poem, Ausonius' *Cento nuptialis*, was written at the instigation of the emperor Valentinian.

extreme form such poems show a retreat from referentiality.[16] Optatianus Porfyrius' figure poems, themselves imitative of Hellenistic models, are an early high-point in this development. The tradition, though, continues throughout Late Antiquity: Ausonius' *Technopaegnion*, the poetry of Lampridius in the mid-fifth century, as characterized by Sidonius (*Epistula* 8. 11. 5), and the figure poems of Venantius Fortunatus all continue this trend. The tendency to treat individual words or discrete compositional units as separate, semantically detachable items invested with their own brilliance probably derives from the methods of grammatical instruction, which Marrou memorably likened to 'admiring a string of pearls held between the fingers, examining each grain one after the other for its particular beauty.'[17] Such attitudes went hand in hand with the educational tradition and their influence is evident in less extreme form in many poems of the period.

Nemesian's promise to write a historical epic in praise of the young emperors Carinus and Numerian exemplifies a characteristic development of Latin poetry in Late Antiquity, the ubiquity of forms of praising. In addition to Claudian's epics on the wars against Gildo and the Goths, we know that Proba, the author of a Vergilian cento on biblical subject matter, wrote on the emperor Constantius' defeat of the usurper Magnentius in the mid-fourth century. Priscian and Corippus were to continue this tradition in sixth-century North Africa and Constantinople. In all these cases epic assimilates to poetry of praise. It is notoriously the case that both Claudian's historical epics and his verse panegyrics show a similar combination of narrative and praising, though the one group of poems is structured chronologically, the other thematically. Epic comes regularly to be thought of as a genre of praising in Late Antiquity. To take one example, Tiberius Claudius Donatus (late fourth, early fifth century) speaks of the *Aeneid* as belonging to the *genus laudativum*, in which Vergil must show that his hero is 'free from all fault and worthy to be extolled with great acclaim' (*magno praeconio praeferendum*).[18]

---

[16] Herzog R. (ed.), *Restauration und Erneuerung: Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.* (Munich 1989) 32–37.

[17] Marrou H.-I., *St Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (fourth ed., Paris 1958) 25. See also Roberts M., *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca, NY 1989) and Levitan W., "Dancing at the End of the Rope: Optatian Porfyry and the Field of Roman Verse", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 115 (1985) 245–269.

[18] Donatus 1:2. 24–25. I quote Donatus from the edition of Georgii H., *Tiberii Claudi Donati ad Tiberium Claudium Maximum Donatianum filium suum Interpretationes Vergilianae*, 2

For the writers of Late Antiquity, then, epic was one strategy—and an especially prestigious one—for praising a person of high status. This attitude to epic, which already has precedents in the classical period, finds expression in the preface to Juvencus' biblical epic on the life of Christ. The Christian poet compares himself with secular poets who enhance the fame and praise (*famam laudesque*, *praef.* 8) of great men of the past by celebrating their lofty actions (*sublimia facta*, 6). (He cites Homer and Vergil as preeminent among such poets, so he clearly has epic in mind.) By comparison with those who sing 'the deeds of past heroes' (*veterum gestis hominum*, 16) he will sing 'the actions of Christ's life / Christ's life-bringing actions' (*Christi vitalia gesta*, 19). He thereby hopes to win not just the literary immortality of the great non-Christian poets but eternal life through the merits of his own poem. The hagiographical epic, which emerges a century or so later in the poems on St. Martin of Paulinus of Périgueux (460s) and Venantius Fortunatus (mid-570s) as in part a spin-off from the New Testament epic, conforms to this generic expectation. Both poets speak of themselves as praising the deeds (*gesta*) of the saint.[19]

For secular poets the impulse to praise arose from the hierarchical condition of society and the need to win patronage. The ceremoniousness of the late Roman world provided ample occasion for the recitation of such compositions. For religious poets the person to be praised was God, Jesus, or a particularly holy figure. This understanding of praise and the forms in which it was expressed was conditioned by their rhetorical and grammatical education. But there was also a prestigious biblical model of praise poetry, the Psalms, to which they could appeal. So Paulinus of Nola, in writing to the philosophically inclined poet Jovius, recalls his correspondent's past poetry on 'earthly deeds, praising the glorious triumph of kings' (*terrena referres / gesta, triumphantum laudans insignia regum*, *Carmen* 22. 22–23). The language bears some similarity to Horace's definition of the subject matter of epic as 'the deeds of kings and commanders and cruel war' (*res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella*, *Ars Poetica* 73). In one way or another Jovius seems to have

---

vols. (Leipzig 1905–1906; reprint Stuttgart 1969). Reference is to volume, page, and line. On Donatus' Vergil interpretation see Starr R.J., "An Epic of Praise: Tiberius Claudius Donatus and Vergil's *Aeneid*", *Classical Antiquity* 11 (1992) 159–174.

[19] See Roberts M., "The Last Epic of Antiquity: Generic Continuity and Innovation in the *Vita Sancti Martini* of Venantius Fortunatus", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 131 (2001) 259–267.

combined narrative and panegyric in a fashion typical of Late Antiquity. But now in a complementary prose epistle Paulinus urges Jovius to 'dedicate to God [his] intellectual skills and the resources of his mind and tongue, sacrificing to him, as it is written, an offering of praise (*sacrificium laudis*) with eloquent voice and devout heart.'[20] In so doing, Jovius, like the psalmist, will be putting into practice God's injunction of Psalm 49.14, 'sacrifice an offering of praise to God' (*immola Deo sacrificium laudis*), which Paulinus quotes here. The passage is a favorite of Paulinus. He uses it also of his own poetry in a letter to Sulpicius Severus. In that instance Paulinus is sending along with his letter one of his *Natalicia* in honor of the feast day of St. Felix. In composing this poem, he writes, he is 'sacrificing an offering of praise to Christ' (*Epistula* 28. 6).[21] The language has strong liturgical connections, lending Christian poetry something of the quality of a liturgical act. *Sacrificium laudis* and *hostia laudis* come to be used of the recitation of the Office and indeed of the offering of the Eucharist. But Paulinus perhaps has in mind the gloss on *hostia laudis* in Hebrews 13. 15 as 'the fruit of our lips confessing his name' (*fructum labiorum confitentium nomini eius*). Both the Psalms and Christian poetry fit this definition.

Poetry of hagiographical content, as can be seen in the case of Paulinus, can also be described as a sacrifice of praise to God or Christ. Although its immediate subject is the saint, that individual's holy life and miracles ultimately redound to the glory of God (cf. Paulinus of Périgueux, *Vita sancti Martini*, 2.682–683).[22] Indeed all Christian poetry can be described as *laudes Domini*.[23] This is the title attributed to the earliest Christian Latin poem in classical meter; in the sixth century the

---

[20] Paulinus of Nola, *Epistula* 16. 9 : 'Ingenii autem tui facultates et omnes mentis ac linguae opes deo dedica immolans ei, sicut scriptum est, sacrificium laudis ore facundo et corde devoto.' Compare the language Augustine used of Paulinus when, a few years earlier, he urged the young poet Licentius to take Paulinus as his example: 'Go and learn with what resources of his intellect (*opibus ingenii*) he (i.e., Paulinus) offers sacrifices of praise (*sacrificia laudis*) to God.'

[21] Paulinus of Nola, *Epistula* 28. 6 : 'Immolans Christo hostiam laudis et reddens altissimo vota mea.' The phrase *hostia laudis* occurs a number of times in Paulinus' writings: *Carmina* 18. 447, 24. 15, *Epistulae* 13. 14, 19. 2, 23. 35, 49. 13. For this language in Paulinus see Stella F., "Fra retorica e innografia: sul genere letterario delle *Laudes Dei* di Draconzio", *Philologus* 132 (1988) 267; for the influence of the Psalms on Paulinus Fontaine J., "Le poète latin chrétien nouveau psalmiste", in *Études sur la poésie latine tardive d'Ausone à Prudence* (Paris 1980) 138–141.

[22] Paulinus of Périgueux, *Vita s. Martini* 2. 682–683: 'Ad cuius (sc. Domini) laudem recte referemus ovantes, / quae nunc miramur servos potuisse fideles.'

[23] See Stella, "Fra retorica e innografia" (note 21) 263–267.

poet Arator attributes his turn from secular to Christian subject matter to the urging of his friend Parthenius, who bids him 'turn [his] voice's career to the praise of the Lord' (*ad Domini laudes*, *Ep. ad Parthenium* 56).[24] Caelius Sedulius, the author of the *Carmen paschale*, the second New Testament epic and most influential of the biblical poems from Late Antiquity, also appeals to the model of the Psalms in the introductory section of his poem, though his emphasis is somewhat different: 'Why should I, accustomed as I am to sound forth songs on the ten-stringed psalter of David and reverently to stand in the holy choir hymning the deeds of heaven in graceful language, keep silence about the miracles of Christ the salvation-bringer?'[25] Sedulius exploits the ambiguity of the Latin words *canere*, *cantare* and their cognates. They can mean 'sing,' of vocal performance, or 'compose,' of writing poetry. In this way he is able to draw a comparison between the performance of psalmody in church ritual and his proposed project of writing a biblical poem on the miracles of Christ. As Fontaine points out,[26] the emphasis on *miracula* implies a further analogy with the Psalms because of the frequent call of the psalmist to 'recount [God's] miracles' (*narrare mirabilia tua*). Sedulius' poem is a biblical epic in the tradition of Juvencus, frequently Vergilian in its language. But, unlike Juvencus, he advertises not his affiliations with epic in its laudatory function, but with the Psalms as a model miracle narrative.

The relationship between narrative and praise, both functions of the Psalms, would be a familiar issue to students of the rhetorical schools. In speeches of praise, for instance, the speaker must decide in praising his subject's virtues whether to organize the material chronologically, following the historical sequence of an individual's life, or thematically, according to the particular virtues, with events introduced out of chronological sequence to illustrate the qualities of the *laudandus* (Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 3. 7. 15). To some degree this opposition between chronological and thematic sequence underlies the distinction between historical epic and epic panegyric. But for the Christian poet it helps sanction a structure that focuses on individual praiseworthy actions or

---

[24] Arator, *Epistula ad Parthenium* 56 : 'O utinam malles … / ad Domini laudes flectere vocis iter.'

[25] Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1. 23–26 : 'Cur ego, Daviticis adsuetus cantibus odas / cordarum resonare decem sanctoque verenter / stare choro et placidis caelestia psallere verbis, / clara salutiferi taceam miracula Christi?'

[26] Fontaine J., *Naissance de la poésie dans l'occident chrétien: Esquisse d'une histoire de la poésie latine chrétienne du IIIe au VIe siècle* (Paris 1981) 249.

events at the expense of chronological sequence. The miracle stories in the *Carmen paschale* follow each other with the slimmest of temporal connectives. They illustrate 'Christ's marvelous salvation-bringing powers' (*mirabiles Christi salubresque virtutes, Opus paschale* 1. 1).[27] In the words of the psalmist, Sedulius 'narrates the praises of God, his powers and the miracles he performed' (*narrantes laudes Dei et virtutes eius et mirabilia eius quae fecit, Psalm* 77. 4). The association of praise, narrative, and virtues, despite the specifically Christian sense of *virtutes* here, accords with the strategies of praising taught in the schools of rhetoric.

In handling narrative Christian poets also will have been aware of the rhetorical precepts relating to the statement of facts (Latin *narratio*) in forensic and deliberative oratory. It has often been observed that Christian poetry is typically directed to some spiritual or didactic goal. The aesthetic qualities of poetry are not an end in themselves but serve a further Christian purpose for the author or reader. In Horatian terms (*A. P.* 343) such poetry combines the *utile* with the *dulce*. In other words Christian poetry regularly aims to persuade, that is, it is rhetorical.[28] (I use the word in a neutral sense. In no way do I intend it to be pejorative.) It is not surprising, then, that in some respects the use of narrative in Christian poetry responds to the analysis of the statement of facts in treatises on rhetoric. For the writer or speaker who wishes to persuade to a particular point of view the narrative is not introduced for its own sake, but only to serve that larger purpose. Although in a law case the speaker will aim to give the impression that he is merely communicating the unvarnished facts, he will actually do all he can to introduce evaluative or interpretative language into his narrative to influence his audience to his point of view. Although the Christian poet does not have a jury to persuade and can count on a readership that is likely to be receptive to his message, in his desire to communicate an attitude to or an understanding of the narrative he will typically introduce language that implies evaluation or exegesis.

Secondly the *narratio* in forensic oratory was typically viewed as distinct from argument and proof. In it the speaker strove to appear detached. But when the facts to be presented were particularly lengthy or complicated or the actions being narrated particularly egregious, he might break up the statement of facts into distinct parts each with a

---

[27] Sedulius, *Paschale opus*, ed. J. Huemer, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 10 (Vienna 1885) 175–303, here 177.1.

[28] Poetry of meditation perhaps is an exception to this persuasive intent.

subjoined proof or, where appropriate, an expression of indignation or pity at the events he was describing. This practice of subjoining commentary to individual sections of narrative, as well as the habit in panegyric of seeing individual, chronologically distinct narrative units as illustrative of virtues, will have contributed to the habitual compositional pattern of Christian Latin narrative poetry. These factors coincide with a variety of other considerations, both specific to the Christian community (e.g., the use of pericopes of biblical texts in the liturgy) and common to the broader literary community of Late Antiquity (the general tendency to compose in discrete compositional units). For the Christian poet the motive is not to persuade a jury but to shape the narrative into a convincing expression of his pious sentiments or message. Broadly speaking, the thrust of his commentary will be exegetical, homiletic, meditative, or celebratory. Each has its own characteristic rhetorical mode (didactic, exhortatory, lyric, ornate), though in practice the categories can overlap. An individual poem may ring the changes on the different voices, but if one predominates it will tend to give the poem a distinctive stamp. (For instance, Paulinus of Périgueux' *Life of Martin* is characteristically exhortatory, Fortunatus' poem on the same saint tends to the lyric and celebratory.)

Perhaps the best example in Christian Latin poetry of the productive interaction of rhetorical categories of praising with the biblical model for praise poetry of the Psalms is Dracontius' *De laudibus Dei* (490s, cited hereafter as *L.D.*), as Professor Stella has demonstrated in a 1988 article.[29] At the end of his poem Dracontius refers specifically to the rules for a rhetorical speech of praise: 'no one has spoken your praise appropriately or ever will do, for the canonical structure of a speech of praise (*formula laudis*) takes in three time periods, but you are outside time.'[30] As Vollmer saw, the reference can be explained by a passage in Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria* 3. 7. 10) that analyzes the contents of the speech of praise of an individual in terms of the period before birth, lifetime, and death and posthumous reputation.[31] But, as Dracontius goes on to say (*L.D.* 3. 740) there is nothing before or after God. Characteristically

[29] Stella, "Fra retorica e innografia" (note 21) 258–274.
[30] Dracontius, *De laudibus Dei* 3. 737–739 : 'Quamvis nemo tua praeconia congrua dixit / aut unquam dicturus erit, nam formula laudis / temporibus tribus ire solet, tu temporis expers.'
[31] Vollmer F., *Fl. Merobaudis Reliquiae, Blossii Aemilii Dracontii Carmina…*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica : Auctores Antiquissimi 14 (Berlin 1905) 112; but see Moussy C., in C. Moussy – C. Camus (eds.), *Dracontius, Oeuvres*, 4 vols. (Paris 1985–1996) 2:137.

of the rhetorically trained writer, Dracontius associates praise with narrative. He goes on to say that if there can be no *laudator*, at least there can be a *narrator*, someone to recount God's creation. But again doubts intervene. As he explains at the end of book 1, no created person can narrate even the slightest work of the creator (*L. D.* 1. 750–751).[32] The passages seem to leave no recourse; both books 1 and 3 end with tears, of penitence and prayer.

Dracontius' apparent defeatism owes a great deal to the circumstances in which he wrote the poem, as a prisoner in Carthage, having incurred the anger of the Vandal king Gunthamund.[33] In fact his poem includes a good deal of narrative. Most prominently an account of the Creation, Fall and Expulsion from Paradise occupies much of book 1. As Stella has seen, it and other narrative passages in the poem can be understood in the terms of rhetorical panegyric: the portions of narrative are organized thematically to illustrate God's virtues, in the case of the narrative in book 1 his goodness and mercy (*pietas*).[34] Both sections of the Genesis story, Creation and Fall and Expulsion, end with passages praising God's *pietas* (*L. D.* 1. 427–436 and 556–561). The relation of narrative and praise is that of the rhetorical panegyric.

Despite the likely influence of rhetorical ways of thinking—and Dracontius' *Romulea* includes verse declamations—when he speaks of poetry or song (*carmina / cantus*) in the *De laudibus Dei* the poet's model is the Psalms, along with other Old Testament cantica. In the final passage of book 3 Dracontius prays to be able 'to sing [God's] praises in poetry' (*cantare tuas per carmina laudes, L. D.* 3. 736). The *De laudibus Dei* contains a number of references to such praise songs. Most extensively in book 2 (*L. D.* 2. 208–244), where all parts of the universe, dwellers in heaven, stars and heavenly bodies, meteorological and geographical phenomena, vegetation, and animals unite to hymn God. The passage recalls Psalm 148 and the three youths in the fiery furnace of Daniel 3. 51–81, in both of which the singers call on all creation to praise and exalt God.[35] Elsewhere the newly created birds sing in praise of their creator (*L. D.* 1. 245) and the first man rejoices to hymn his creator as soon as he receives a voice (1.346–347). The practice of psalmody

---

[32] Dracontius, *De laudibus Dei* 1. 750–751 : 'Nemo valet narrare creatus / vel modicum facientis opus.'

[33] See Moussy–Camus, *Dracontius* (note 31) 1:18–29.

[34] Stella, "Fra retorica e innografia" (note 21) 269, understands the narrative in book 1 as corresponding to the section on birth in the panegyric of an individual.

[35] Moussy–Camus, *Dracontius* (note 31) 1:345–346.

unites all creation; in heaven God's praise is continuous (*L. D.* 1. 21). Christian poetry aspires to join the universal chorus from which, in Dracontius' account, humankind was alienated by original sin. Much of the rest of book 2 is an account of humanity's alienation from God and subsequent redemption. The book ends with the Crossing of the Red Sea, a type of salvation, and illustration both of God's *pietas*, to the Israelites, and his righteous *ira*, against the Egyptians. Reintegrated humanity now joins in a song of triumph, the canticum of Moses and the Israelites in Exodus 15. 1–21: 'Both sexes vie to sing in great choruses the praise of God, beating the timbrels with their hands and celebrating the triumph of God's victory in dance.'[36] The biblical text refers to separate choruses of men and women (15. 1 and 20), but Dracontius' introduction of the cliché of late Roman descriptions of ceremony, *sexus uterque*, apparently envisaging (in *certatim*) a joint celebration, reminds us of the affinity such scenes have with late antique forms of public spectacle. The conceptual world of Dracontius reconciles psalmody and secular forms of praising. Even the acclamation of the universe for God recalls passages in the late Latin panegyrics in which the appearance of the emperor, like the epiphany of a god, prompts the miraculous rejuvenation and fertility of nature (*Panegyrici Latini* 8. 3. 1, 11. 9. 2).[37] In both cases, though on a much smaller scale in the imperial panegyrics, the natural world responds to the majesty of the divine (or quasi-divine). The Psalms and biblical cantica emphasize the centrality of song to such ceremonial occasions. For the Christian poet the experience of psalmody provides a model in his own lived experience of such a ritual performance that ideally replicated the continual hymn of praise to God in heaven and the joy of man, when first receiving voice, in praising his creator (*L. D.* 1. 21 and 347).

Fast forward to late sixth-century Gaul and a second 'last poet,' Venantius Fortunatus, described as 'the last poet of antiquity and the first of the Middle Ages.'[38] In Gaul certainly Fortunatus is a pivotal fig-

---

[36] Dracontius, *De laudibus Dei* 2. 802–804: 'Sexus uterque Deo magnas in laude choreas / certatim resonant et palmis tympana pulsant / et celebrant vincente Deo saltando triumphum.'

[37] Cf. Menander rhetor 417. 32–418. 4: D.A. Russell – N.G. Wilson (eds.), *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford 1981) 170–171, of images of cities in representations of processions for a governor giving thanks and applauding.

[38] Bernt G., *Das lateinische Epigramm im Übergang von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter* (Munich 1968) 118. To take two other examples, Pietri L., "Venance Fortunat et ses commanditaires: Un poète italien dans la société gallo-franque", *Settimane di studio del*

ure. After him there is no substantial poet writing in classical meters until the Carolingian period, some two centuries later. Fortunatus himself wrote very much in the late Roman tradition. Like his predecessors he looks back to Vergil, Horace, and the first-century poets from the classical period. From Late Antiquity Ausonius and Sidonius influence his secular poetry, while Sedulius is the preeminent influence among a range of Christian poets with whom he is familiar. It is symptomatic that one of the first poems he wrote after he left his native North Italy for Francia and the court at Metz was an epithalamium for King Sigibert and his Visigothic bride Brunhild that conformed closely to the late Roman tradition established by Statius and continued by Claudian, Sidonius, and Ennodius.

Like Claudian moving from Egypt to Milan, Fortunatus on his arrival in Gaul from Italy was looking for patrons for his poetry. Much of his corpus was written in the service of such patrons and serves their interests. But despite the impulse to praise that he shares with Claudian, his compositions are very different in nature. There is nothing comparable to the lengthy verse panegyrics of Claudian, Merobaudes, and Sidonius. In what follows I want to examine the distinctive qualities of Fortunatus' poetry and try to relate them to the social and cultural context of late sixth-century Francia.

In his prose Fortunatus shows a capacity to adapt style to subject matter and audience. He writes in at least three distinct styles. His letters to Gallic bishops and the prefaces to his saints' lives are artfully composed in the elaborately convoluted style typical of late Roman epistolography. His two prose exegetical treatises, on the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, are more straightforward, the latter heavily reliant on Rufinus. In the simplicity of their syntax and vocabulary they are suited to their didactic purpose. Finally, the saints' lives are written in less correct Latin than the other two categories of texts. They would be suitable for delivery before a mass audience on the saint's feast day.[39]

Centro Italiano di studi sull' alto medioevo 39 (1992) 733, adopts D. Tardi's description of Fortunatus as 'the last great representative of ancient Latin poetry,' while Walsh P.G., "Venantius Fortunatus", *The Month* 120 (1960) 293, calls him the first medieval poet of major stature.

[39] See Collins R., "Beobachtungen zu Form, Sprache und Publikum der Prosabiographien des Venantius Fortunatus in der Hagiographie des römischen Gallien", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 92 (1981) 16–38, and Banniard M., *Viva voce: Communication écrite et communication orale du IVe au IXe siècle en Occident latin* (Paris 1992) 50–52.

In style they do not differ a great deal from the prose works of his contemporary and patron, Gregory of Tours.[40]

What, then, of the poetry? Does it show any adjustment in style and content to suit its Frankish context? And does the poetry vary in style as the prose does? To the first question some answer can be given. It is striking that although Fortunatus is familiar with the traditions of late Roman poetry, his practices of praising are substantially different from the verse panegyrics of a Claudian or Sidonius. The exception is the epithalamium for Sigibert and Brunhild, an early composition. In it he incorporates a mythological narrative, invoking Venus and Cupid, who conspire to bring together the bridal couple. This is in the late Roman tradition, deriving ultimately from Statius. But Fortunatus was never to use such language again. In his praise poetry too he shows similar reticence. Even in his most elaborate royal panegyric, for King Chilperic (9.1), he makes no use of the personifications of cities, countries, and provinces that are so much a part of the epicizing late Roman tradition. This omission is revealing. The practice of using such personifications, like the use of mythological narratives in epithalamia, served to encode the status of the figure to be praised. To understand such a composition required familiarity with the system of meaning on which it depended. It may well be that at least some of his audience did not have that knowledge.

Apart from its use in the epithalamium, mythology plays only a limited role in Fortunatus' poetry. It is confined primarily to the poems he wrote to a small group of secular magnates whom he first got to know shortly after his arrival at the court of Metz. All were to pursue careers in the administration of the Frankish kingdoms. Letters of two of these men, Gogo and Dynamius, are preserved in the collection known as the *Epistulae Austrasicae* and show them to be practitioners of the highly ornate style Fortunatus himself employed in his prose correspondence. These men constituted a well-educated intellectual elite, to whom Fortunatus wrote a number of admiring verse letters. Among them the late Roman habit of epistolary exchange still apparently thrived.

The bishops of Merovingian Gaul constituted a second important group among Fortunatus' addressees. Here too he could often expect an educated readership.[41] He engages in an exchange of mutual com-

---

[40] Bonnet M., *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours* (Paris 1890) 75.

[41] Riché P., *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West from the Sixth through the Eighth Century*, trans. by J.J. Contreni (Columbia, SC 1976) 266–274, and Wood I., "Law and

pliments with Felix of Nantes concerning each other's literary accomplishments in a manner long familiar in the correspondence of Late Antiquity. (He has a similar exchange with Martin of Braga.) Gregory of Tours not only receives the dedication of Fortunatus' first collection of poems and of his *Life of Martin*; he also sends the poet a metrical treatise with the request that Fortunatus compose something in Sapphics. Less specifically, when Fortunatus praises a bishop he regularly makes special mention of his subject's eloquence. The typical bishop, it seems, had a good literary education and was capable of preaching forcefully and eloquently to his flock.[42] Fortunatus, then, could count on a receptive audience for his poetry at least among the higher clergy.

But, as already noted, things had changed since the heyday of late antique epideictic poetics. Most obviously the situations for poetic performance were scaled down. Fortunatus most often composes his poetry for local bishops or dignitaries. Even the few royal panegyrics fall short of the great imperial or consular ceremonies that form the setting for Claudian and Sidonius. The poems are short by those standards, often epigrammatic in nature, suited to the more intimate settings in which many of them were delivered. (When a setting is mentioned, it is usually a banquet.)

The question remains whether Fortunatus wrote only for the educated elite, both lay and clerical, or whether he expected his audience to include others who lacked the training of his more sophisticated listeners. Generally scholars have argued for the former.[43] Certainly the ability to compose fluently in quantitative meters must have been a rare commodity in Merovingian Gaul. To be praised in such poetry will have conferred cultural capital on the *laudandus* (or *laudanda*). To a lesser extent those in the audience who appreciated such a recitation will also derive status from the shared occasion. Poetry, in Reydellet's

---

Culture in Merovingian Gaul", in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge 1990) 63–81.

[42] For the evidence from epitaphs see Heinzelmann M., *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien: Zur Kontinuität römischer Führungsschichten vom 4. bis 7. Jahrhundert. Soziale, prosopographische und bildungsgeschichtliche Aspekte*, Beihefte der Francia 5 (Munich 1979), and Consolino F.E., *Ascesi e mondanità nella Gallia tardoantica: Studi sulla figura del vescovo nei secoli IV–VI*, Koinonia 4 (Naples 1979) 117–167.

[43] E.g. Godman P., *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford 1987) 11–12, cited by Hen Y., *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, A.D. 481–751* (Leiden 1995) 208–211.

terms, will have become a social ritual accompanying public performances of status.[44]

Roger Wright speaks of 'the production of metric Latin poetry on the original quantitative basis [as] a recherché pursuit of the learned, an esoteric accomplishment of antiquarians.'[45] In a linguistic community no longer attuned to differences of quantity the rules for such poetry had to be acquired in the schools. But while the ability to write such poetry and to appreciate its metrical form was restricted to an educated elite, this need not necessarily require that that group also constituted its sole audience. Most, perhaps all, of Fortunatus' poetry is to be read aloud. (The *Life of Martin* might be an exception.) In such circumstances Norberg has argued persuasively that quantitative verse was spoken according to the normal accents of everyday speech.[46] The effect of such pronunciation will be that a sense of the quantitative basis of the meter poetry is lost, but this will provide no obstacle to understanding the poem's meaning. Wright apparently contrasts rhythmic verse with quantitative poetry when he says of the former that it 'usually was destined for oral performance in an intelligible manner.' But if quantitative poetry was recited in the way Norberg describes it is not clear why it should be any less intelligible than rhythmic poetry. Understanding would presumably depend on the syntactical and lexical complexity of the poetry in question, whether rhythmic or quantitative. It is perhaps significant, then, that Fortunatus' poetry shows stylistic qualities that would have enhanced its intelligibility and its appeal to the ear.

With very few exceptions all of Fortunatus' praise poetry after the epithalamium is in the elegiac meter. The choice is significant. Already in the classical period each couplet frequently formed a self-contained unit of sense. Fortunatus enhances this regularity. A syntactic unit rarely runs over from the hexameter to the pentameter. Both the hexameter and pentameter show coincidence of sense units with the most important divisions of the line. Rhyme, antithesis, and paronomasia set off successive syntactical units (*commata*) and reinforce the play of sound and sense. In the pentameter Fortunatus' preference for dactyls over spondees often leads to isosyllabism between the two halves of the line.

---

[44] Reydellet M., "Tradition et nouveauté dans les *Carmina* de Fortunat", in *Venanzio Fortunato tra Italia e Francia* (Treviso 1993) 96.

[45] Wright R., *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France*, ARCA 8 (Liverpool 1982) 67.

[46] Norberg D., "La récitation du vers latin", in *Au seuil du Moyen Age: Études linguistiques, métriques et littéraires* (Padua 1974) 131–134.

This treatment of the elegiac couplet breaks it up into discrete compositional units that are readily perceptible aurally, even for an audience not attuned to distinctions of quantity.

To take a simple example, Fortunatus' poem for Bishop Magnericus of Trier occupies twenty-four lines. There is a clear sense break between every line and often each half of the hexameter or pentameter corresponds to a complete phrase.[47] In four cases antithetical units occupy the two halves of the line (all pentameters that encapsulate or rephrase in a memorable way the content of the preceding hexameter).

> 1. rite minister agens, ecce magister ades (10).
> 2. dum capit ille polum, tu capis arce locum (14).
> 3. nec sua damna dolet, dum tua lucra tenet (16).
> 4. spem mihi dans veniae, sit tibi palma, pater (24).

Effects of repetition of sound contribute to the perception of the sense. In examples 2 and 3 *polum* and *locum*, *dolet* and *tenet* rhyme. (There are two other examples of rhyme between the two halves of a line in the poem.)[48] More characteristic is the use of assonance, a feature of quantitative Latin poetry at least since Sedulius in the second quarter of the fifth century.[49] Each half of example 1 concludes with a succession of four identical vowels, reinforced by the paronomasia of *minister* and *magister*. In the case of 4 the final vowels of *veniae* and *pater* were sounded identically (compare *insuper* and *lanceae* in Fortunatus' hymn *Vexilla regis*, *Carmen* 2. 6. 9–10). Of the twenty-four lines of the poem all but seven have assonance or rhyme between the concluding syllables of the two halves of the line. In the seven other lines effects of sound help to direct the hearer and emphasize the structure and sense (e.g., *crevit … crescere fecit*, 13; *optandus, iucundus*, 17; *intende … venerande.* 21). Finally, both

---

[47] In four cases (2, 4, 7, 8) the second half of the line is occupied by an ablative absolute. (I give the text of the poem at the end of this paper, following the edition of E. Malaspina, *Il Liber epistolarum della cancelleria austrasica (sec. V–VI)*, Biblioteca di Cultura Romanobarbarica 4 [Rome 2001] 120–123, with a few minor changes, mainly of punctuation.)

[48] According to Reydellet, "Tradition" (note 44) 87–88, Fortunatus makes slightly less use of rhyme between the penthemimeral caesura and the end of the line than Ovid and Propertius, but a far higher percentage of his rhymes are between words that have no grammatical connection. In Fortunatus rhyme points up the parallelism between equivalent *commata* rather than, as most often in classical authors, being the consequence of grammatical agreement between nouns and adjectives.

[49] Gladysz B., *De extremis quibus Seduliana carmina ornantur verborum syllabis inter se consonantibus*, Eos Supplementum 17 (Leopolis 1931).

hexameters that fall into three commata rather than two (1 and 19) have their second break after the bucolic diaeresis. Sense, structure, and sound are mutually reinforcing in this poem. Although simpler than many of Fortunatus' compositions, the qualities it displays are not untypical of the corpus as a whole. For hearers the effects of sound and structure will compensate for their inability to perceive the quantitative basis of the meter. The language is simple and for the most part the praise of the bishop is conventional. Fortunatus, in accordance with his normal procedure, repeats language found elsewhere in his poetry. The predictability of the sentiments contributes to the effectiveness of the poem as panegyric, a form that typically contains 'expressions of recognized values serving to reinforce adhesion to what is already accepted.'[50] Although we cannot know for certain if the poem was recited and, if so, before whom, its qualities of sound suit it well for oral delivery. Banniard has shown that even the illiterate in a congregation could be expected to understand passages of Merovingian hagiography read out at a saint's festival.[51] There is no reason to believe that a poem like that on Magneric would not be largely intelligible to such an audience, while its effects of sound and structure could not only aid intelligibility but also provide aesthetic pleasure.

It is wrong, then, to posit an absolute opposition in this period between quantitative poetry, as outdated and antiquarian, and rhythmic poetry, as in tune with the times.[52] Certainly in Fortunatus' case his elegiac poetry compensated for the lack of the accentual patterns of rhythmic compositions with abundant aural effects and by exploiting the natural articulation of the dactylic lines. This particular poem, in fact, is not found in the Fortunatus manuscripts. Instead it is one of only two poems included in the *Epistulae Austrasicae*, a collection of sample documents made at the court of King Childebert II in Metz in the mid-590s.[53] The other poem is a *rhythmus*, dating to the early 470s, from Auspicius of Toul to Arbogast, count of Trier. It is the earliest document in the collection. The juxtaposition is suggestive. Rhythmic and quantitative poetry in the manner of Fortunatus equally represent best practice in the royal chancellery.

---

[50] L'Huillier M.-Cl., *L'Empire des mots: Orateurs gaulois et empereurs romains, 3e et 4e siècles* (Paris 1992) 107.

[51] Banniard, *Viva voce* (note 39) 254–271.

[52] See Wright, *Late Latin* (note 45) 67–68.

[53] Malaspina, *Il Liber epistolarum* (note 47) 7–9 (the poem is also preserved in the later *Vita Magnerici*).

Fortunatus' praise poetry varies in its level of ambition and its expansiveness of content. But at whatever length he writes, he retains the qualities that are evident in his Magneric poem. Many of his compositions have the quality of scripts for a celebration, a banquet or other public occasion. They are appropriate to be delivered aloud; they appeal to the ear. In that respect they have something in common with other spoken or sung forms of praise that accompany ceremony. In their enumerations of titles and virtues his poems recall secular acclamations. The chant-like effect of his carefully structured compositions has reminded some of church song and psalmody.[54] Such poems invite the audiences' joyful engagement with the mood of celebration they engender. His longest elegiac poem, *On Virginity*, begins with an evocation of the heavenly chorus joyfully (*laetantur*, 2) singing the Psalms of David while applauding (or beating time) with their hands (*carmine Davitico plaudentia bracchia texunt*). In so doing, 'they lovingly render to God a sound of praise in his honor' (*reddit honorificum laudis amore sonum*, 6). For the Christian in this world that heavenly choir finds its echo in the performance of church song.[55] But in Fortunatus' poetry such language is not confined to ecclesiastical or celestial contexts. A variety of occasions, sacred and secular, involve some combination of praise, plaudits, and rejoicing (*laudes*, *plaudere*, *gaudia*).[56] The verb *plaudere*, in particular, and its cognates refer to the audible component of such celebration. *Plausus* can involve the beating of hands, but also singing or the playing of musical instruments, and the verb is coupled with *canere*, *cantare*, or *sonare*.[57] Most often *plaudere* is associated with communal celebration, whether it is the people of Tours combining to welcome their

[54] Reydellet, "Tradition" (note 44) 87, draws a parallel with the Psalms. Fortunatus, of course, wrote two famous hymns for the holy cross in quantitative meters, *Pange, lingua* (2. 2, trochaic septenarii) and *Vexilla Regis* (2. 6, iambic dimeters). But he also wrote a third poem on the cross (*Crux benedicta nitet*, 2. 1) in elegiac couplets that found its way into the liturgy, as did portions of his elegiac poem for an Easter celebration of Bishop Felix at Nantes (3. 9); see Messenger R.E., "*Salve Festa Dies*", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947) 208–222, and Szövérffy J., *Die Annalen der lateinischen Hymnendichtung: Ein Handbuch*, 2 vols. (Berlin 1964–1965) 129–132 and 137–138.

[55] *Expositio antiquae liturgiae Gallicanae* 2. 1: 'Consuetudo est constituta cantandi ut qui verbis non conpunguntur suavitate modolaminis moveantur, pensantes quanta sit dulcedo caelestis cantici quando in incolatu huius saeculi tam eleganter resonat ecclesia laudes Christi.'

[56] The assonance of *laudes*, *plaudere*, and *gaudia* will have reinforced their semantic association.

[57] *Plaudit* and *laus sonat*, 6. 2. 7–8 (cf. 9. 16. 5–6); *plaudat* and *canat*, 7. 8. 63–64 (cf. 10. 11. 34); *cantat* and *plaudit*, 10. 7. 29–30.

new bishop or to hail his return to the city (*Carmen* 5. 3. 1, 5. 8. 7–8), barbarians and Romans acclaiming King Charibert with one joyful strain of praise (*Carmen* 6. 2. 7; cf. 11), or the whole of nature greeting with a chorus of rejoicing Easter Day and the Resurrection (*Carmen* 3. 9. 24 and 43). Fortunatus includes himself in this last chorus, as 'the meanest sparrow' (*Carmen* 3. 9. 46), contributing his own voice to the symphony of sound. I would like to suggest that Fortunatus' own praise poetry aspires to contribute to the occasions for which he wrote this element of rhythmic rejoicing, a text for celebration, that has affinities both with the spoken and sung aspects of contemporary secular and ecclesiastical ritual.[58]

To sum up, late Latin poetry begins, in my narrative, with the return to classical and first-century models and the rediscovery of a public voice for poetry in the late third century. Claudian is clearly in this tradition. He both marks an end point, the last writer of mythological epic, and is an important stimulus to the practice of epideictic poetic forms in Late Antiquity. Simultaneously Christian poetry reaches a first high point at the end of the fourth century. The requirements of church song, the new expressive demands of Christian asceticism and the cult of the saints, as well as the growing maturity of Latin biblical exegesis and the familiarity of the liturgy, find poetic form in the hymns of Ambrose and the poetry collections of Prudentius and Paulinus of Nola. One subject common to sacred and secular poetry is praise. Christian poetry as a whole could be conceived of as *Laudes Domini*, 'praise of the Lord.' Poets from Paulinus of Nola on cite the Psalms as model for Christian poetry. Although in Paulinus himself and Sedulius the formal influence of the Psalms is not pronounced, the *De laudibus Dei* of the North African poet Dracontius seeks inspiration both in secular rhetoric of praise and in the biblical practice of the Psalms. Fortunatus is heir, then, to both secular and ecclesiastical traditions of praising and to the communal enactment of praise in ceremonies of the church and public life. His poetry marks a distinctive response to these late Roman traditions.

More, then, than Claudian Fortunatus marks a watershed. His poetry clearly is in the late antique tradition. But at least in Gaul he was

---

[58] Fortunatus shows himself sensitive to musical celebrations, whether the performance of matins at the church of Bishop Germanus in Paris (2. 9. 49–62) or the fantasy chorus of many nations and musical instruments sounding the praise of Duke Lupus (7. 8. 61–70).

to have no immediate successors. A century and a half separates him from the next substantial Gallic poets writing in quantitative meter. By that time the linguistic circumstances in the region, which, if I am right, conditioned some important qualities of Fortunatus' poetry, had changed. The reforms of Alcuin, linguists have stressed, marked the final divorce between the Latin of the educated, learned in schools, and the spoken language of the *populus*.[59] But despite the changed circumstances Fortunatus remained a popular poet in the Carolingian period. As a courtier, composing for the powerful figures of his day, he provided a model for writers at the Carolingian court.[60] His poetry is born from the coming together of late Roman literary tradition and the circumstances of reception in Merovingian Gaul. The particular form he developed, what we might call the panegyrical epigram, became an available model for imitation for subsequent poets, even when cultural conditions had changed.

Fortunatus, *Appendix* 34 = *Epistulae Austrasicae* 14 (*De Magnerico Treverensi episcopo*)

> Culmen honorificum, patrum pater, arce sacerdos,
>   pontificale decus proficiente gradu,
> quem fidei titulo mercis erexit in altum,
>   ecclesiaeque caput distribuente deo,
> 5 discipule egregii, bone Magnerice, Niceti,
>   nominis auspicio magne canende tui,
> clare sacro merito, tanto informante magistro,
>   quem reparas operum fructificante loco,
> cuius, opime, sequax sancta et vestigia servans
> 10   rite minister agens, ecce magister ades
> auctorisque pii successor dignus haberis;
>   heredesque sui frugiparensque manet.
> crevit post obitum pater et te crescere fecit:
>   dum capit ille polum, tu capis arce locum.
> 15 Grex alitur per te vice praecessoris, alumne,
>   nec sua damna dolet, dum tua lucra tenet.
> Fratribus optandus, iucundus honore ministris,
>   carius et populis pastor amore places.
> Te panem esuriens, tectum hospes, nudus amictum,
> 20   te fessus requiem, spem peregrinus habet.

---

[59] Wright R., *Late Latin* (note 45) 104–118; cf. Banniard, *Viva voce* (note 39) 305–422, with the comments of Wright R., *A Sociophilological Study of Later Latin* (Turnhout 2002) 60–64.

[60] Godman, *Poets and Emperors* (note 43) 38.

Haec faciens intende magis, venerande sacerdos,
    ut commissa tibi dupla talenta feras.
Pro Fortunato exorans quoque, dulcis amator,
    spem mihi dans veniae, sit tibi palma, pater.

Honorable eminence, father of fathers, lofty bishop,
glory of the episcopate, as your status advances,
whom the reward for your faith has raised on high,
and the primacy of the church, bestowed by God,
good Magneric, pupil of the excellent Nicetius,
by the omen of your name bound to be called great,
famed for your holy worth, shaped by such a teacher,
whom you replicate in fruitful performance of good works
whose follower you are, noble one, whose holy footsteps you keep,
by service as a minister you now stand forth a teacher,
and are deemed a worthy successor to your holy father;
he lives an heir to himself and fertile parent.
Your father has grown after his death and caused you to grow too:
while he takes a place in heaven, you do so on high.
The flock is fed by you its fosterer in your forerunner's place
and does not grieve its loss while it profits from your gain.
Admired by monks, by deacons honored and beloved,
the people love and cherish you as their dear shepherd.
In you the hungry find food, the stranger shelter, the naked clothing,
the weary find in you rest and the traveler hope.
By these acts, reverent bishop, strive all the more
to double the talents that have been entrusted to you.
Pray for Fortunatus too, I beg, sweet beloved,
and in giving me hope of pardon, may you, father, win the palm.

Select Bibliography

Primary sources

ARATOR, *Historia apostolica*, ed. A.P. McKinlay, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasti-
    corum Latinorum 72 (Vienna 1951)
DONATUS, Tiberius Claudius, *Ad Tiberium Claudium Maximum Donatianum filium
    suum Interpretationes Vergilianae*, ed. H. Georgii, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1905–1906;
    reprint Stuttgart 1969)
DRACONTIUS, Blossius Aemilius, *Carmina*, ed. Fr. Vollmer, Monumenta Germa-
    niae Historica: Auctores Antiquissimi 14 (Berlin 1905)
——, *Oeuvres*, ed. Cl. Mousy – C. Camus, 4 vols. (Paris 1985–1996)
——, *Epistulae Austrasicae*, ed. E. Malaspina in *Il Liber epistolarum della cancelleria
    austrasica (sec. V–VI)*, Biblioteca di Cultura Romanobarbarica 4 (Rome 2001)

FORTUNATUS, Venantius Honorius Clementianus, *Poèmes*, ed. M. Reydellet – S. Quesnel (Paris 1994–2004)

IUVENCUS, Gaius Vettius Aquilinus, *Evangeliorum Libri quattuor*, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 24, ed. J. Huemer (Vienna 1891).

MENANDER Rhetor, *Menander Rhetor*, ed. D.A. Russell – N.G. Wilson (Oxford 1981)

PAULINUS, Meropius Pontius, *Carmina*, ed. W. de Hartel, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 30 (Vienna 1894); M. Kamptner (Vienna 1999²)

——, *Epistulae*, ed. W. de Hartel, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 29 (Vienna 1894); M. Kamptner (Vienna 1999²)

PAULINUS of Périgueux, *Carmina*, ed. M. Petschenig, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 16 (Vienna 1888)

SEDULIUS Caelius, *Opera omnia*, ed. J. Huemer, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 10 (Vienna 1885)

Secondary Literature

BANNIARD M., *Viva voce: Communication écrite et communication orale du IVe au IXe siècle en Occident latin* (Paris 1992)

BARCHIESI A., "The Crossing", in S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature* (Oxford 2001) 142–163

BERNT G., *Das lateinische Epigramm im Übergang von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter* (Munich 1968)

BONNET M., *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours* (Paris 1890)

CAMERON A., *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda in the Court of Honorius* (Oxford 1970)

——, "Poetae Novelli", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 84 (1980) 127–175

CAMERON Av., *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley 1991)

COLLINS R., "Beobachtungen zu Form, Sprache und Publikum der Prosabiographien des Venantius Fortunatus in der Hagiographie des römischen Gallien", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 92 (1981) 16–38

CONSOLINO F.A., *Ascesi e mondanità nella Gallia tardoantica: Studi sulla figura del vescovo nei secoli IV–VI*, Koinonia 4 (Naples 1979)

CONTE G.B., *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. by J.B. Solodow (Baltimore 1994)

FO A., *Studi sulla tecnica poetica di Claudiano* (Catania 1982)

FONTAINE J., "Le poète latin chrétien nouveau psalmiste", in *Études sur la poésie latine tardive d'Ausone à Prudence* (Paris 1980) 131–144

——, *Naissance de la poésie dans l'occident chrétien: Esquisse d'une histoire de la poésie latine chrétienne du IIIe au VIe siècle* (Paris 1981)

——, "Christentum ist auch Antike: einige Überlegungen zu Bildung und Literatur in der lateinischen Spätantike", *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 25 (1982) 5–21

GLADYSZ B., *De extremis quibus Seduliana carmina ornantur verborum syllabis inter se consonantibus*, Eos Supplementum 17 (Leopolis 1931)

GODMAN P., *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford 1987)

GRAF F. (ed.), *Einleitung in der lateinische Philologie* (Stuttgart 1997)

GRIMAL P., *La littérature latine* (Paris 1994)

HADAS M., *A History of Latin Literature* (New York 1952)

HEINZELMANN M., *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien: Zur Kontinuität römischer Führungsschichten vom 4. bis 7. Jahrhundert. Soziale, prosopographische und bildungsgeschichtliche Aspekte*, Beihefte der Francia 5 (Munich 1979)

HEN Y., *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, A.D. 481–751* (Leiden 1995)

HERZOG R. (ed.), *Restauration und Erneuerung: Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.* (Munich 1989)

KENNEY E.J. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. 2. *Latin Literature* (Cambridge 1982)

LEVITAN W., "Dancing at the End of the Rope: Optatian Porfyry and the Field of Roman Verse", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 115 (1985) 245–269

L'HUILLIER M.-CL., *L'Empire des mots: Orateurs gaulois et empereurs romains, 3e et 4e siècles* (Paris 1992)

MARROU H.-I., *St. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris 1958⁴)

MEHMEL F., *Virgil und Apollonius Rhodius: Untersuchungen über die Zeitvorstellung in der antiken epischen Erzählung* (Hamburg 1940)

MESSENGER R.E., "*Salve Festa Dies*", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947) 208–222

NORBERG D., "La récitation du vers latin", in *Au seuil du Moyen Age: Études linguistiques, métriques et littéraires* (Padua 1974) 123–134

PIETRI L., "Venance Fortunat et ses commanditaires: Un poète italien dans la société gallo-franque", *Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di studi sull' alto medioevo* 39 (1992) 729–758

RABY F.J.E., *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (Oxford 1957²)

REYDELLET M., "Tradition et nouveauté dans les *Carmina* de Fortunat", in *Venanzio Fortunato tra Italia e Francia* (Treviso 1993) 81–98

RICHÉ P., *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West from the Sixth through the Eighth Century*, trans. by J.J. Contreni (Columbia, SC 1976)

ROBERTS M., "Rhetoric and Poetic Imitation in Avitus' Account of the Crossing of the Red Sea ('De Spiritalis Historiae Gestis' 5.371–702)", *Traditio* 39 (1983) 29–80

——, *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca, NY 1989)

——, "The Last Epic of Antiquity: Generic Continuity and Innovation in the *Vita Sancti Martini* of Venantius Fortunatus", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 131 (2001) 257–285

——, "Venantius Fortunatus' Elegy on the Death of Galswintha (*Carm.* 6.5)", in ed. R.W. Mathisen – D. Shanzer, *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul Revisiting the Sources* (Aldershot 2001) 298–312

——, "Vergil and the Gospels: The *Evangeliorum Libri IV* of Juvencus", in ed. R. Rees, *Romane Memento: Vergil in the Fourth Century* (London 2004) 47–61

SCHANZ M., *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinians* 4 vols. in 5, rev. ed. by C. Hosius – G. Krüger (Munich 1914–1935)

STARR R.J., "An Epic of Praise: Tiberius Claudius Donatus and Vergil's *Aeneid*", *Classical Antiquity* 11 (1992) 159–174

STELLA F., "Fra retorica e innografia: sul genere letterario delle *Laudes Dei* di Draconzio", *Philologus* 132 (1988) 258–274

SZÖVÉRFFY J., *Die Annalen der lateinischen Hymnendichtung: Ein Handbuch*, 2 vols. (Berlin 1964–1965)

TEUFFEL W.S., *History of Roman Literature*, 2 vols., trans. by G.C.W. Warr (Cambridge 1900)

WALSH P.G., "Venantius Fortunatus", *The Month* 120 (1960) 292–302

WOOD I., "Law and Culture in Merovingian Gaul", in ed. R. McKitterick, *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge 1990) 63–81

WRIGHT R., *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France*, ARCA 8 (Liverpool 1982)

——, *A Sociophilological Study of Later Latin* (Turnhout 2002)

CHAPTER NINE

THE LATIN LITERATURE OF THE LATE MIDDLE AGES: CONSTRUCTIONS OF A PERIOD

Thomas Haye

1. *Introduction*

Representations of literary history follow the rules of serialism, one-dimensionality, and continuity:[1] First of all, the texts are presented as chronologically successive and, secondly, as characteristic of the respective epoch; thirdly, the texts are presented in such a way that a specific text—or a specific group of texts—derives logically, genetically, and harmoniously from another text or group of texts. It is obvious that this philological construction cannot be applied to any literature as differently structured as medieval Latin literature, which is organized mainly in relation to ancient-pagan, biblical, and patristic models. In addition, in the case of Latinity further problems are caused by the element of teleology underlying all histories of literature, which ascribes a historical goal, or rather a historical task which has to be completed, to the literature discussed.[2] Teleology is expressed by words conveying a temporal perspective and a belief in progress like 'still,' 'already,' 'not yet,' and 'no more,' but neither linguistic developments nor those of literary genres justify such a word choice when describing medieval Latinity.

Moreover, each and every representation of literary history or history in general is determined by so-called 'master narratives,' by certain

---

[1] For a detailed discussion, cf. Haye Th., "Die Periodisierung der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters—literaturwissenschaftliche Meistererzählungen als axiomatische und narrative Muster der Objektkonstitution und Strukturbildung". To be published in F. Rexroth (ed.), *Meistererzählungen vom Mittelalter*, Historische Zeitschrift. Beiheft (2006).

[2] For German literary studies, cf. Harms W., "Metapherngesteuerte Wertungen in Literaturgeschichten und deren Auswirkungen auf die Ziele der Beschäftigung mit Literatur und auf die Kanonbildung", in P. Wiesinger (ed.), *Akten des X. Internationalen Germanistenkongresses Wien 2000: Zeitenwende—Die Germanistik auf dem Weg vom 20. ins 21. Jahrhundert*, vol. 8 (Bern 2003) 33–38, esp. 34.

central patterns of interpretation on a meta-level which set the narrative framework and thereby determine the overall process of sense-making.[3] Even representations of the 'history of Latin literature of the Middle Ages' cannot escape this narrative convention but work—sometimes consciously, sometimes not—with periodizations based on the fiction both of limits between periods and of patterns of development.[4] The literary historian is a storyteller: A 'good' story is characterized by its 'roundness,' having a beginning and an end and, between those two stations of the narrative, some dramatic climaxes and turning points.[5] Not only the overall plot structure and that of the sub-plots 'the early Middle Ages,' 'the high Middle Ages,' and 'the late Middle Ages' are developed in this way, but also that of 'renaissances' (Carolingian Renaissance, Ottonian Renaissance, twelfth-century Renaissance, Italian Renaissance) within those sub-plots. These terms, though, not only mark chronological phases but simultaneously suggest an evaluation on a metaphorical level.[6]—Anything 'early' can hardly be mature and accomplished. Anything 'high' has to be of 'high poetic quality.'

---

[3] Cf. Jarausch K.H. – Sabrow M. (eds.), *Die historische Meistererzählung. Deutungslinien der deutschen Nationalgeschichte nach 1945* (Göttingen 2002), particularly the editors' introduction (9–32); Motzkin G., "Das Ende der Meistererzählungen", in J. Eibach – G. Lottes (eds.), *Kompass der Geschichtswissenschaft: ein Handbuch* (Göttingen 2002) 371–396; White H., *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore 1973); White H., "Der historische Text als literarisches Kunstwerk", in C. Conrad – M. Kessel (eds.), *Geschichte schreiben in der Postmoderne. Beiträge zur aktuellen Diskussion* (Stuttgart 1994) 123–157; Schönert J., "Literaturgeschichte", in H. Fricke (ed.), *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*, vol. 2 (Berlin–New York 2000) 454–458; Perkins D., *Is Literary History Possible?* (Baltimore–London 1992); Uhlig K., *Theorie der Literarhistorie. Prinzipien und Paradigmen*, Britannica et Americana, third series, vol. 1 (Heidelberg 1982); Japp U., *Beziehungssinn. Ein Konzept der Literaturgeschichte* (Frankfurt a.M. 1980).

[4] A refusal of periodization can be found in Leonardi C. (ed.), *Letteratura latina medievale (secoli VI–XV). Un manuale*, Millennio Medievale 31, Strumenti 2 (Florence 2002). Instead of differentiating between early, high, and late Middle Ages on the grounds of philological findings, the editor takes a pragmatic and a-historic approach, dividing the medieval millenium into the ten centuries and arranging the texts according to the respective century in which they were written.

[5] Cf. White H., "Der historische Text" (note 3) 126; cf. Perkins D., *Is Literary History Possible?* (note 3) 39: 'The possible plots of narrative literary history can be reduced to three: rise, decline, and rise and decline. The reason for this is that the hero of a narrative literary history is a logical subject—a genre, a style, the reputation of an author—and the plots are limited to what actions or transitions can be predicated of such heroes.'

[6] On the use of the metaphors 'rise', 'flourishing', and 'decline' in nineteenth-century German literary histories, cf. Pfaffenberger W., *Blütezeiten und nationale Literaturgeschichtsschreibung. Eine wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Betrachtung* (Frankfurt a.M. 1981).

Those being 'late' in the course of literary history, those who come 'too late,' will be punished by Philology. In contrast, anything 'reborn' will, without a doubt, be characterized by its newness and freshness. Usually literary historical representations of medieval Latin also suggest evaluations by opposing climax and anticlimax—to use the terms in their original meaning: There is the dynamic tricolon of 'rise—flourishing—decline' as well as the triad of 'predecessors—classics—epigones.' The popular pattern of a development 'from the beginnings to the flourishing' (i.e. in the high Middle Ages) is, in contrast, presented as a scale of two opposing poles.[7] When declaring Latin literature to be flourishing during the high Middle Ages, it is self-evident that the literatures of the thirteenth and fourteenth century can, as a result, only be labelled 'decadent' and 'declining.'

These observations and theoretical reflections lead to the question of how to characterize the actual state of the late medieval Latinity more adequately.[8] Due to the intrinsically meta-epochal layout of Latin literature,[9] it would be natural not to speak of the 'Latin literature of the late Middle Ages,' but rather—neutrally and exclusively chronologically—of the 'Latin literature during the late Middle Ages.'

---

[7] Cf. for example the chapters in Langosch K., *Mittellatein und Europa. Führung in die Hauptliteratur des Mittelalters* (Darmstadt 1990) "I. The Foundation" ("I. Die Grundlegung"), dealing with the literature written between 500 and 850 A.C.; "II. The Build-up" ("II. Der Aufbau"), discussing the literature produced from c. 850 to 1050; "III. The Completion" ("III. Die Vollendung") dealing with the literature produced between c. 1050 and 1200; "A Medieval Latin Fade-Out" ("Ein mittellateinischer Ausklang"), discussing examples from thirteenth-century literature.

[8] Late medieval Latinity is characterized by Brunhölzl F., "Die lateinische Literatur", in K. von See (ed.), *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, vol. 8: W. Erzgräber (ed.), *Europäisches Spätmittelalter* (Wiesbaden 1978) 519–563.

[9] Cf. Rädle F., "Lateinische Literatur", in H.A. Glaser (ed.), *Deutsche Literatur. Eine Sozialgeschichte*, vol. 2: I. Bennewitz – U. Müller (eds.), *Von der Handschrift zum Buchdruck: Spätmittelalter, Reformation, Humanismus* (Reinbek 1991) 274–286; on 274, Rädle states: 'Da also lateinische Sprache und lateinische Literatur des Mittelalters eingebunden sind in eine hochgeschätzte und ausdrücklich gepflegte Tradition, die für ganz Europa galt, ist es eigentlich nicht möglich, das späte Mittelalter als eine Epoche der lateinischen Literaturgeschichte für eine besondere Betrachtung einfach zu isolieren.' Already Curtius E.R., *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern–Munich 1961³) 34, argued against fixing periods in a way that would disrupt continuous lines of developments: 'Sollte sich die Menschheitsgeschichte noch einige Jahrtausende oder Jahrzehntausende fortsetzen, so wird die Historie genötigt sein, ihre Epochen zu numerieren, wie die Archäologen das für Altkreta tun: Minoisch I, II, III, mit je drei Unterabteilungen.' Cf. also the meta-epochal conception in Fuhrmann M., *Die Antike und ihre Vermittler. Bemerkungen zur gegenwärtigen Situation der Klassischen Philologie*, Konstanzer Universitätsreden 9 (Konstanz 1969) 30–32.

Though this would be objective, it would refuse the sense-making of the past. If one, on the other hand, actually examines the literature's 'essence,' i.e. its poetic quality and ethic orientation, it is first of all remarkable that the well-established category 'Latin literature of the late Middle Ages' is defined not only in regard to time but also in regard to space: Its meaning is restricted to the literature produced north of the Alps between 1250 and 1500, while the late medieval Italy (a *contradictio in adiecto*) is presented as taking a 'Sonderweg,' as developing in a unique and special way. The Latinity produced in that period is thus perceived as dichotomous. A definition of the character of 'late medieval' Latinity—that is, the one produced north of the Alps—as constitutive of a period in its own right and as decisively distinct requires references to three relations: to its relations to the previous and to the following period respectively, and to its relation to normative poetics.[10] In the following, these three relations will be examined more closely.

2. *Drawing the Line Between the High and Late Middle Ages*

Examining the relation of the late Middle Ages to the previous period means to analyse in what respects the periods differ and which continuities and discontinuities can be observed. In literary histories, the reason given for making a distinction between the late Middle Ages and high Middle Ages is usually that after the latter important traditions of literary genres are petering out and breaking off. The most striking example in this context is the epic. While between 1100 and 1250 a constant flow of epic texts occurs (epics composed after the manner of classical Antiquity, historical epics, panegyric epics on contemporary issues, crusade epics, beast epics, allegorical epics, biblical epics), north of the Alps this tradition decreases significantly in the following period. Particularly the tradition of epics with topics derived from classical Antiquity (Troy, Alexander the Great, etc.) can be said to end with Albertus Stadensis's *Troilus* (written 1249),[11] and even in Italy it only resumes nearly a century later with Petrarch's *Africa* (1340); the last important panegyric epic on contemporary issues is Justinus de Lippia's *Lippi-*

---

[10] Japp U., *Beziehungssinn* (note 3) 88.
[11] Merzdorf Th. (ed.), *Troilus Alberti Stadensis* (Leipzig 1875).

florium (1247).[12] Only few epics can be found during the late Middle Ages, for example, Conrad of Megenberg's *Planctus ecclesie in Germaniam* (1337) and Simon de Couvin's *De iudicio Solis* (1350), both allegorical epics.[13]

The secular poetry of the late Middle Ages is as well, compared to that of the previous period, less frequent, less liberal, and probably also less erotic and less imitative of ancient models. Ovid can hardly be called the guiding light of late medieval poetry, on the contrary: It can by no means be accidental that during this period two central works—the pseudo-Ovidian autobiography *De vetula* (ca. 1260)[14] and the polemic *Antiovidianus* (before 1396)[15]—are written which turn the tables on the Roman writer of love poetry, partly criticizing him, partly trying to purge him.[16] Due to this anti-Ovidianian movement the genre of elegiac comedies, which was so important during the high Middle Ages, loses its significance almost completely in the thirteenth century and is continued only in Italy in a small number of texts.

Compared to the high Middle Ages, beyond Italy a significant decrease of poetry imitating ancient models can thus be observed after 1250; Roman motifs and literary forms lose their status as authorities. The playful and humorous or solemn element in poetry is replaced by a primarily and immediately moralising one. Didactic prose, in contrast, though not a new genre in itself, gains significance and becomes the central genre in the literary production of the period: Numerous introductions, summary treatises, encyclopaedias, and dictionaries are written in the thirteenth and fourteenth century. Furthermore, the increase of geographical mobility both within Europe and beyond is mirrored

---

[12] Althof H. (ed.), *Das Lippiflorium. Ein westfälisches Heldengedicht aus dem 13. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig 1900).

[13] Littré E. (ed.), "Opuscule relatif à la peste de 1348 composé par un contemporain", *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 1ère sér., t. 2 (1840–1841) 201–243.

[14] Klopsch P. (ed.), *Pseudo-Ovidius De Vetula*. Untersuchungen und Text, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 2 (Leiden–Cologne 1967); Robothan D.M. (ed.), *The Pseudo-Ovidian De vetula* (Amsterdam 1968).

[15] Burdach K., *Aus Petrarcas ältestem deutschen Schülerkreise. Texte und Untersuchungen. Unter Mitwirkung Richard Kienasts*, Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation. Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Bildung 4 (Berlin 1929) 79–111; Guthmüller B., *Ovidio Metamorphoseos vulgare. Formen und Funktionen der volkssprachlichen Wiedergabe klassischer Dichtung in der italienischen Renaissance*, Veröffentlichungen zur Humanismusforschung 3 (Boppard 1981) 80–83.

[16] Smolak K., "Ovid im 13. Jahrhundert—zwischen Ablehnung und Bewunderung", in C. Leonardi – B. Munk Olsen (eds.), *The Classical Tradition in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Spoleto 1995) 111–122.

in the budding genre of travel writing. Despite all these changes and differences, one should not overlook the fact that many of the traditional genres of high medieval literature, such as, for example, religious poetry or the (metric or rhythmic) satire, continue well into the late Middle Ages.

Since a further criterion to draw a line between two periods are literary responses to earlier texts, it has to be analysed which texts from the high Middle Ages were still read and had literary responses in the following period.[17] Considering what has been said so far, it can hardly be surprising that most of the epics composed during the eleventh and twelfth century were almost unknown in the late Middle Ages so that no literary responses exist. The great popularity of Walter of Châtillon's *Alexandreis* or Alanus ab Insulis's *Anticlaudianus* is definitely not representative of the esteem in which this genre as a whole was held. The generally low interest is already reflected by the state of textual witnesses:[18] The crusade epic *Solimarius* by the poet Gunther survives only in fragments of a total of 240 verses.[19] Even fewer, namely only 26 hexameters are transmitted of Joseph Iscanus's *Antiocheis*, written around the same time.[20] William Brito's *Karlotis*, composed around 1200, has disappeared entirely. Of Nicolaus de Braia's *Carmen de gestis Ludovici VIII* 1,870 verses are transmitted.[21] Moreover, since there is so little manuscript evidence of the surviving epics, they may be considered to have been virtually unknown during the late Middle Ages: Stephen of Rouen's *Draco Normannicus*,[22] Albertus Stadensis's *Troilus*,[23] and Johannes de Garlandia's epic on the Albigensians, *De triumphis ecclesiae*,[24] have been transmitted in only a single manuscript each. In some cases, for example, in the case

---

[17] Cf. Haye Th., "Die verlorene Bibliothek des Reiner von Lüttich—Produktion und Überlieferung lateinischer Literatur des hohen Mittelalters in der Perspektive monastischer Individualisierungstendenzen", *Historisches Jahrbuch* 125 (2005) 39–65, esp. 40.

[18] On transmission, cf. Hunger H., *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur*, vol. 2 (Zurich 1964); on medieval Latinity 9–185.

[19] Cf. Assmann E. (ed.), *Gunther der Dichter. Ligurinus*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum 63 (Hannover 1987) 499–512.

[20] Cf. Gompf L. (ed.), *Joseph Iscanus. Werke und Briefe* (Leiden–Cologne 1970) 212.

[21] Edited by M.-J.-J. Brial in M. Bouquet (ed.), *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, vol. 17 (Paris 1878) 311–345.

[22] Howlett R. (ed.), *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I*, vol. II, Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores 82 (London 1885), esp. 589–777; Omont H. (ed.), *Le Dragon Normand et autres poèmes d'Étienne de Rouen* (Rouen 1884) 1–167.

[23] Merzdorf Th. (ed.), *Troilus* (note 11).

[24] Wright Th. (ed.), *Johannis de Garlandia De triumphis ecclesiae libri octo* (London 1856).

of Gunther's *Ligurinus*[25] and Odo Magdeburgensis's *Gesta ducis Ernesti*,[26] the text has only been transmitted in an early modern print based on a medieval codex which itself has not come upon us.

The lyric *opera* and corpora of poetic letters of important poets—for instance, the works of Fulcoius Belvacensis (d. after 1083), of Rodulfus Tortarius (1063–1114), of Baldricus Burgulianus (1046–1130), of Hilarius Aurelianensis (c. 1075 – c. 1150), of Marcus Valerius (eleventh / twelfth centuries), of Stephen of Rouen (d. after 1170), and of Rahewin (d. c. 1175)—have usually also been transmitted in only a single manuscript. An interest in such genres thus cannot be stated for the late Middle Ages. On the other hand, the major authors of didactic writings of the high Middle Ages, particularly the grammarians (Alexander de Villa Dei, Johannes de Garlandia, Eberhardus Bethuniensis), continue to be read during the entire late Middle Ages and into the sixteenth century. In addition, works like Abelard's *Historia calamitatum* or Andreas Capellanus's tract *De amore* become classics. In other words, on the level of both reader-response and writer-response a genre-specific mix of continuity and discontinuity can be found.

It would without a doubt be best to legitimate the constitution and profile of a late medieval Latinity by referring to contemporary testimonials articulating a consciousness of a different period. But if one does attempt to trace those, one has to realize that contemporary statements do not support the commonly accepted view of a cesura between the high and late Middle Ages as the authors are rather aware of the continuities. Similarly, the late medieval literary histories and catalogues of authors—determined by master narratives themselves—neither show any distancing from the previous period.[27]

---

[25] Assmann E. (ed.), *Gunther der Dichter* (note 19).

[26] Gansweidt B., *Der "Ernestus" des Odo von Magdeburg. Kritische Edition mit Kommentar eines lateinischen Epos aus dem 13. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1989).

[27] On the genre of literary histories, cf. Blum R., "Die Literaturverzeichnung im Altertum und Mittelalter", *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 24, 1 (1983) 2–256; Lehmann P., "Literaturgeschichte im Mittelalter", in Lehmann P., *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart 1959²) 82–113.

3. *Drawing the Line Between the Late Middle*
Ages and the Renaissance or Early Modern Period

If one is to believe the textbooks, the late medieval Latin literature is, after the fifteenth-century linguistic and ideological paradigm shift, superseded by the 'Neo-Latin literature.'[28] Even today this deep cesura is still reflected by the academic differentiation between two disciplines—the Medieval Latin philology[29] and the Neo-Latin philology[30]—both of which are dealing with Latin literature written after classical Antiquity. But neither north nor south of the Alps, the transition from the late medieval to the humanistic tradition of literature is that evident and clear-cut, the periods therefore are rather hard to define conceptually.[31] This difficulty can be demonstrated with regard to the gen-

---

[28] An introduction to the constitution and profiling of Neo-Latin literature is Ludwig W., "Die neuzeitliche lateinische Literatur seit der Renaissance", in F. Graf (ed.), *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie* (Stuttgart–Leipzig 1997) 323–356; Ludwig W., "Neulateinische Literatur", in H. Fricke (ed.), *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*, vol. 2 (Berlin–New York 2000) 703–707.

[29] On the history and profile of the discpline in Germany, cf. Berschin W., "Mittellateinische Philologie in Deutschland im XX. Jahrhundert, I: Das frühe Mittelalter—Probleme der Edition mittellateinischer Texte", in *La Filologia Medievale e Umanistica Greca e Latina nel Secolo XX. Atti del Congresso Internazionale Roma, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche Università La Sapienza 11–15 dicembre 1989*, vol. I, Testi e Studi Bizantino-Neoellenici VII (Rome 1993) 77–88; Jacobsen P.C., "Mittellateinische Philologie in Deutschland im XX. Jahrhundert, II: Arbeiten zum hohen und späteren Mittelalter", *La Filologia Medievale e Umanistica Greca e Latina nel Secolo XX. Atti del Congresso Internazionale Roma, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche Università La Sapienza 11–15 dicembre 1989*, vol. I, Testi e Studi Bizantino-Neoellenici VII (Rome 1993) 89–127; Ziolkowski J., "Die Mittellateinische Literatur", in F. Graf (ed.), *Einleitung* (note 28) 297–322; surveys of the present situation in *Latein zwischen Antike und Neuzeit*, Wiener humanistische Blätter. Sonderheft (Vienna 1998); Stotz P., "Zur Lage der Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters", in *Das Mittelalter. Perspektiven mediävistischer Forschung* 2, 2 (1997) 144–146.

[30] On Neo-Latin philology, cf. Schmidt P.L., "Die Studien in Deutschland zur humanistischen und neulateinischen Literatur seit dem ausgehenden 19. Jh.", in *La Filologia Medievale e Umanistica* (note 29) 831–910; Wuttke D., *Deutsche Germanistik und Renaissance-Forschung. Ein Vortrag zur Forschungslage*, Respublica literaria 3 (Bad Homburg–Berlin–Zurich 1968); Conrady K.O., "Die Erforschung der neulateinischen Literatur. Probleme und Aufgaben", *Euphorion* 49 (1955) 413–445; from the older literature the following article should be mentioned: Ellinger G., "Grundfragen und Aufgaben der neulateinischen Philologie", *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 21 (1933) 1–14.

[31] Cf. Schmidt P.G., "Die Entdeckung der mittellateinischen Literatur in der Neuzeit", in P. Stotz (ed.), *Non recedet memoria eius. Beiträge zur Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters im Gedenken an Jakob Werner (1861–1944)*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 28 (Bern–Berlin 1995) 13–24, esp. 16–18; cf. Brunhölzl F., "Die lateinische Literatur" (note 8) 554, who phrases it rather carefully: 'Es ist noch nicht hinlänglich geklärt, in welchem Maße die Humanisten der mittelalterlichen Welt, in der sie gebildet

res: On the one hand, the Latin literature written from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century is special insofar as some genres can indeed be subsumed under the heading 'renaissance,' since they come into being through the 'rediscovery' or 'rebirth' of ancient models. In case of the genres of comedy and tragedy,[32] for example, one can speak of a new beginning in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Italy. In the case of the epic, on the other hand, one encounters a very different situation. Basically, the Latin epics of the Renaissance and the early modern period refer not to medieval but to ancient models. It would not make much sense, though, to speak of a 'renaissance' of the genre in the fourteenth century, since all of the important epics of Roman Antiquity (Vergil, Ovid, Lucan, Statius, Prudentius, etc.) were of course known and appreciated during the late Middle Ages—they even belonged to the canon of texts taught at school. The development of the Neo-Latin verse satire may also serve to illustrate the situation; its philological fate can be exemplified by having a look at the Italian humanist Lorenzo Lippi, who, around 1475, composed a collection of *Satyrae*.[33] When in 1901 Karl Müllner edited these texts for the first time, he commented briefly on the author's literary enterprise: 'So we have with the satires, which to my knowledge were the first to be written according to the model of the ancients, Lippi's swansong in front of us. Their content bears witness to the author's strict moral decency, the form is elegant, and although now and then echoes of the old models, especially of Horace, Persius and Juvenal, can be found—which to expose I think would be unnecessary and irreverent—, these satires nevertheless display a certain originality.'[34] The long-term patron of Neo-Latin philol-

---

waren und von der aus sie einen neuen geistigen Standort zu gewinnen trachteten, tatsächlich verpflichtet waren—die Bindung scheint in manchem doch stärker gewesen zu sein, als bisher zumeist angenommen worden ist.'

[32] A compilation of the few medieval tragedies has been published by F. Bertini, *Tragedie Latine del XII e XIII Secolo*, Pubblicazioni del Dipartimento di Archeologia, Filologia Classica e loro tradizioni in epoca cristiana, medievale e umanistica "Francesco Della Corte", n.s. 155 (Genoa 1994).

[33] IJsewijn J., "Laurentii Lippii Collensis Satyrae V ad Laurentium Medicem", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 27 (1978) 18–44.

[34] Müllner K. (ed.), *Laurentii Lippii Collensis opuscula tria. Programm des k.k. Staats-Ober-Gymnasiums zu Wiener–Neustadt am Schlusse des Schuljahres 1900–1901* (Wiener–Neustadt 1901) 3: 'So haben wir denn in den vorliegenden Satiren, die meines Wissens die ersten waren, die nach dem Muster der Alten gedichtet wurden, den Schwanengesang Lippis vor uns. Ihr Inhalt zeugt von dem sittlichen Ernste des Verfassers, die Form ist gewandt, und wenn auch hie und da Anklänge an die alten Muster, besonders Horaz, Persius und Iuvenal sich finden,—die aufzudecken, ich für unnöthig und pietätlos hielt—so

ogy, Josef IJsewijn, was the first to arrange the Latin satires of the Renaissance and the early modern period chronologically and, as a result, was able to prove Müllner's view to be completely misleading. Instead of casting the poet of the late Quattrocento in the role of the *primus inventor*, IJsewijn dated the onset of the tradition back to Albertinus Mussatus, writing around 1300.[35] This leads to the question of why we should not perceive Lippi's satires also as part of the tradition of the Latin verse satire as it existed north of the Alps in the high and late Middle Ages. This tradition is, as far as its language, topics, and intentions are concerned, just as much influenced by Horace, Persius, and Juvenal as its neither temporally nor spatially that far removed successors in proto-Renaissance Italy. It leads to an unnecessary distortion of the literary historical perspective to attempt to ignore the 'late Middle Ages' and declare the Latin *satira* to resume only in the fourteenth century.

The situation of didactic poetry is similar: Its monumental late medieval tradition neither breaks off in the fifteenth century but is continued—both north and south of the Alps—in the humanistic didactic writings.[36] This continuity is particularly evident in the case of those poetical forms developed only in the Middle Ages which—sometimes inconspicuously—live on well into the seventeenth century.[37] Continuity can also be found in the religious writings of the thirteenth and fourteenth century.

Here again, one should ask for contemporaneous comments. Numerous literary comments are known especially from Italian authors of the late fourteenth and fifteenth century who propagate a distinct differentiation between 'gothic' Latinity and a 'renaissance' of imitating ancient models.[38] But one should bear in mind that many of these

---

entbehren diese Satiren nicht einer gewissen Originalität.' (quotation in the text transl. by H.R. Garlt.)

[35] IJsewijn J., "Neo-Latin Satire: Sermo and Satyra Menippea", in R.R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700* (London–New York 1976) 41–55, esp. 51.

[36] Cf. Haye Th., *Das lateinische Lehrgedicht im Mittelalter. Analyse einer Gattung*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 22 (Cologne–Leiden 1997).

[37] Cf. for example Rädle F., "Über mittelalterliche lyrische Formen im neulateinischen Drama", in M. Borgolte – H. Spilling (eds.), *Litterae medii aevi. Festschrift für Johanne Autenrieth zu ihrem 65. Geburtstag* (Sigmaringen 1988) 339–362; Smolak K., "Latinistik der Mitte", in *Latein zwischen Antike und Neuzeit*, Wiener humanistische Blätter, Sonderheft (Wien 1998) 32–46, esp. 42.

[38] Brunhölzl F., *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Munich 1975)

authors are the first to use the medieval master narrative so that their narrative suggestions should not be taken over unreflectedly by any twenty-first century philologist. More recent research has demonstrated that despite the proclaimed distancing from the so-called Middle Ages, the literary production at that time is in many regards determined by continuity rather than discontinuity. Two examples may serve as an illustration: In 1501, the highly renowned physician, astrologist, and poet Dietrich Ulsen published a *Speculator consiliorum enigmaticus*, which became one of his greatest literary successes.[39] What his contemporaries did not know, though, is the fact, that this didactic poem is essentially a copy of a medieval medical poem from the Salernitan school.[40] Ulsen has taken over large parts of the original without any modification, added only an introduction and an epilogue, and given the 'new' work a title appealing to contemporary taste. Similarly, after entering a contest of poets with Johannes Dantiscus in 1512, Eobanus Hessus produced—within a few hours and not entirely sober—the impressive epyllion *Victoria Christi*, astonishing his contemporaries. Only in 1986 Harry Vredefeld discovered that Eobanus shamelessly drew on the anonymous medieval poem *Triumphus Christi heroicus*."[41] These two random examples prove that the giants of the humanistic period occasionally do sit on the shoulders of the high and late medieval dwarves.

4. *The Quality of the Period—In Regard to the Poetic Norm*

If one considers the late medieval Latinity—despite the numerous continuities in regard to both the preceding and following period—as a period in its own right, one can state that it is marked by a huge increase in the number of writings produced. But the major part of

---

3, remarks correctly: 'Das Ende der Epoche wird durch den Übergang der mittelalterlichen zur neulateinischen (zunächst der humanistischen) bezeichnet; es wird analog zur oberen Zeitgrenze dort zu sehen sein, wo die Schriftsteller sich von der mittelalterlichen Bildungswelt, in der sie selbst noch herangewachsen sind, bewußt distanzieren und sich als Träger einer neuen Geisteshaltung fühlen.'

[39] On Dietrich Ulsen, cf. Lawn B., *The Salernitan Questions. An Introduction to the History of Medieval and Renaissance Problem Literature* (Oxford 1963) 113–128.

[40] Cf. Lawn B., *The Salernitan Questions* (note 39) 121.

[41] Cf. most recently Vredeveld H., "Eobanus Hessus in Krakau", in G. Huber-Rebenich – W. Ludwig (eds.), *Humanismus in Erfurt* (Rudolstadt–Jena 2002) 161–176.

these writings are so-called *Gebrauchsschrifttum* (writings which primarily aim at conveying information), while literature in a more restricted sense (i.e. poetry and literary prose) constitutes the smaller part. Nevertheless, it would be inadequate to generalize and speak of a 'decline' or even a 'degeneration' of literature. First of all, the emphasis on different genres in the late Middle Ages can be explained by a different understanding of the purpose of written texts and of what they can achieve. Modern literary histories have hardly paid attention to this aspect of the contemporary perspective on literature. The philological evaluation of the texts has rather been determined by an opposition of epithets used to characterize the respective periods: While the writings from the high Middle Ages tend to be described as 'classicistic,' 'of the manner of classical Antiquity,' 'flawless in form,' 'metrically pure,' 'original,' and 'of an inspired freshness,' the poetry of the late Middle Ages has been characterized as 'scholastic,' 'deviating from the norm,' 'dry,' and 'typically medieval.' Such seldomly questioned ephitets show that medieval Latinity is frequently still evaluated on the grounds of the poetics of classical Antiquity, or rather: in regard to the question, if the authors accepted these and if their texts fulfill the ancient norm.[42] The evaluation of medieval texts as far as their quality and especially their aesthetic value is concerned is thus first and foremost determined by a criterion of mimetic competence. As long as medieval Latinity is seen as an extension of ancient literature and thereby as a phenomenon of literary response and 'living on,' the Latinity of the late Middle Ages can only gain reprove for being less close to the ancient models. This leads to the question if a deliberate deviation from a norm—which is at that time not even accepted in the first place—automatically means producing an inferior literature. The Latin literature of the late Middle Ages follows its own, namely different goals. It can only be evaluated with regard to the question if and by what means it achieves the goals it has set for itself both within and outside the realm of literature.

---

[42] Cf. Rigg A.G., *A history of Anglo-Latin literature 1066–1422* (Cambridge 1992) 3.

5. *Diversification of Literature*

No literature exists in a hermetically secluded realm but is always related to and competing with other literatures. Not only have medieval authors writing in Latin to position themselves towards the monumental ancient text corpus, but they also have to relate to contemporary literature written in the vernacular and national languages. If one takes the synchronicity of literary developments into account, one realizes that the Latinity of the late Middle Ages is produced under completely different circumstances than the learned literature of the early and high Middle Ages. While the Latin literature in the Carolingian period is nearly without competition, the Latinity of the thirteenth and fourteenth century is confronted with both a fully-fledged French and German literature, which massively influence the literary realm at that time and permanently reduce the role of Latin in written and oral communication. The former students of the *lingua latina* have become their competitors, the dialogue turns into an *agon*, and the *agon* results in an increasing dominance of the national languages. It is obvious that the developing division of tasks and the parcelling out of the literary market have to have massive consequences for the genres preferred in late medieval Latinity. Moreover, the enormous rise in the production of texts and the increasing diversification of genres (particularly within the area of writing aimed to convey information) now prevent the development of a inner-literary referentiality as it can be observed for instance in twelfth-century literature. Nevertheless, the late medieval Latinity has produced some classics of its own which need not to be afraid of an unprejudiced comparison with literary highlights from other periods.

Select Bibliography

Primary Sources

ALTHOF H. (ed.), *Das Lippiflorium. Ein westfälisches Heldengedicht aus dem 13. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig 1900)

ASSMANN E. (ed.), *Gunther der Dichter. Ligurinus*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum 63 (Hannover 1987) 499–512

BRIAL M.-J.-J. (ed.), "Carmen de gestis Ludovici VIII", in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. M. Bouquet, vol. 17 (Paris 1878) 311–345

Gansweidt B. (ed.), *Der "Ernestus" des Odo von Magdeburg. Kritische Edition mit Kommentar eines lateinischen Epos aus dem 13. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1989)

Gompf L. (ed.), *Joseph Iscanus. Werke und Briefe* (Leiden–Cologne 1970)

Howlett R. (ed.), *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I,* vol. II, Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores 82 (London 1885)

IJsewijn J., "Laurentii Lippii Collensis Satyrae V ad Laurentium Medicem", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 27 (1978) 18–44

Klopsch P. (ed.), *Pseudo-Ovidius De Vetula. Untersuchungen und Text,* Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 2 (Leiden–Cologne 1967)

Littré E. (ed.), "Opuscule relatif à la peste de 1348 composé par un contemporain", *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* 1ère sér., t. 2 (1840–1841) 201–243

Merzdorf Th. (ed.), *Troilus Alberti Stadensis* (Leipzig 1875)

Müllner K. (ed.), *Laurentii Lippii Collensis opuscula tria. Programm des k.k. Staats-Ober-Gymnasiums zu Wiener–Neustadt am Schlusse des Schuljahres 1900–1901* (Wiener–Neustadt 1901)

Omont H. (ed.), *Le Dragon Normand et autres poèmes d'Étienne de Rouen* (Rouen 1884)

Robothan D.M. (ed.), *The Pseudo-Ovidian De vetula* (Amsterdam 1968)

Wright Th. (ed.), *Johannis de Garlandia De triumphis ecclesiae libri octo* (London 1856)

Secondary Literature

Berschin W., "Mittellateinische Philologie in Deutschland im XX. Jahrhundert, I: Das frühe Mittelalter—Probleme der Edition mittellateinischer Texte", in: *La Filologia Medievale e Umanistica Greca e Latina nel Secolo XX. Atti del Congresso Internazionale Roma, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche Università La Sapienza 11–15 dicembre 1989,* vol. I, Testi e Studi Bizantino-Neoellenici 7 (Rome 1993) 77–88

Blum R., "Die Literaturverzeichnung im Altertum und Mittelalter", *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 24, 1 (1983) 2–256

Brunhölzl F., "Die lateinische Literatur", in K. von See (ed.), *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft,* vol. 8: W. Erzgräber (ed.), *Europäisches Spätmittelalter* (Wiesbaden 1978) 519–563

———, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters,* vol. 1 (Munich 1975)

Burdach K., *Aus Petrarcas ältestem deutschen Schülerkreise. Texte und Untersuchungen. Unter Mitwirkung Richard Kienasts,* Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation. Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Bildung 4 (Berlin 1929) 79–111

Conrady K.O., "Die Erforschung der neulateinischen Literatur. Probleme und Aufgaben", *Euphorion* 49 (1955) 413–445

Curtius E.R., *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern–Munich 1961³)

Ellinger G., "Grundfragen und Aufgaben der neulateinischen Philologie", *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 21 (1933) 1–14

Fuhrmann M., *Die Antike und ihre Vermittler. Bemerkungen zur gegenwärtigen Situation der Klassischen Philologie,* Konstanzer Universitätsreden 9 (Konstanz 1969)

GUTHMÜLLER B., *Ovidio Metamorphoseos vulgare. Formen und Funktionen der volks-sprachlichen Wiedergabe klassischer Dichtung in der italienischen Renaissance*, Veröffentlichungen zur Humanismusforschung 3 (Boppard 1981) 80–83

HARMS W., "Metapherngesteuerte Wertungen in Literaturgeschichten und deren Auswirkungen auf die Ziele der Beschäftigung mit Literatur und auf die Kanonbildung", in P. Wiesinger (ed.), *Akten des X. Internationalen Germanistenkongresses Wien 2000: Zeitenwende—Die Germanistik auf dem Weg vom 20. ins 21. Jahrhundert*, vol. 8 (Bern 2003) 33–38

HAYE Th., *Das lateinische Lehrgedicht im Mittelalter. Analyse einer Gattung*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 22 (Cologne–Leiden 1997)

———, "Die verlorene Bibliothek des Reiner von Lüttich—Produktion und Überlieferung lateinischer Literatur des hohen Mittelalters in der Perspektive monastischer Individualisierungstendenzen", *Historisches Jahrbuch* 125 (2005) 39–65

———, "Die Periodisierung der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters—literaturwissenschaftliche Meistererzählungen als axiomatische und narrative Muster der Objektkonstitution und Strukturbildung". To be published in *Meistererzählungen vom Mittelalter*, ed. F. Rexroth, Historische Zeitschrift. Beiheft (2006)

HUNGER H., *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur*, vol. 2 (Zurich 1964)

IJSEWIJN J., "Neo-Latin Satire: Sermo and Satyra Menippea", in *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700*, ed. R.R. Bolgar (London–New York 1976) 41–55

JACOBSEN P.C., "Mittellateinische Philologie in Deutschland im XX. Jahrhundert, II: Arbeiten zum hohen und späteren Mittelalter", in: *La Filologia Medievale e Umanistica Greca e Latina nel Secolo XX. Atti del Congresso Internazionale Roma, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche Università La Sapienza 11–15 dicembre 1989*, vol. I, Testi e Studi Bizantino-Neoellenici VII (Rome 1993) 89–127

JAPP U., *Beziehungssinn. Ein Konzept der Literaturgeschichte* (Frankfurt a.M. 1980)

JARAUSCH K.H. – SABROW M., "Einleitung", in *Die historische Meistererzählung. Deutungslinien der deutschen Nationalgeschichte nach 1945*, ed. K.H. Jarausch – M. Sabrow (Göttingen 2002) 9–32

LANGOSCH K., *Mittellatein und Europa. Führung in die Hauptliteratur des Mittelalters* (Darmstadt 1990)

LAWN B., *The Salernitan Questions. An Introduction to the History of Medieval and Renaissance Problem Literature* (Oxford 1963)

LEHMANN P., "Literaturgeschichte im Mittelalter", in Lehmann P., *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart 1959[2]) 82–113

LEONARDI C. (ed.): *Letteratura latina medievale (secoli VI–XV). Un manuale*, Millennio Medievale 31, Strumenti 2 (Florence 2002)

LUDWIG W., "Die neuzeitliche lateinische Literatur seit der Renaissance", in F. Graf (ed.), *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie* (Stuttgart–Leipzig 1997) 323–356

———, "Neulateinische Literatur", in H. Fricke (ed.), *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*, vol. 2 (Berlin–New York 2000) 703–707

MOTZKIN G., "Das Ende der Meistererzählungen", in J. Eibach – G. Lottes

(eds.), *Kompass der Geschichtswissenschaft: ein Handbuch* (Göttingen 2002) 371–396

Perkins D., *Is Literary History Possible?* (Baltimore–London 1992)

Pfaffenberger W., *Blütezeiten und nationale Literaturgeschichtsschreibung. Eine wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Betrachtung* (Frankfurt a.M. 1981)

Rädle F., "Über mittelalterliche lyrische Formen im neulateinischen Drama", in M. Borgolte – H. Spilling (eds.), *Litterae medii aevi. Festschrift für Johanne Autenrieth zu ihrem 65. Geburtstag* (Sigmaringen 1988) 339–362

———, "Lateinische Literatur", in H.A. Glaser (ed.), *Deutsche Literatur. Eine Sozialgeschichte*, vol. 2: I. Bennewitz – U. Müller (eds.), *Von der Handschrift zum Buchdruck: Spätmittelalter, Reformation, Humanismus* (Reinbek 1991) 274–286

Rigg A.G., *A history of Anglo-Latin literature 1066–1422* (Cambridge 1992)

Schmidt P.G., "Die Entdeckung der mittellateinischen Literatur in der Neuzeit", in P. Stotz (ed.), *Non recedet memoria eius. Beiträge zur Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters im Gedenken an Jakob Werner (1861–1944)*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 28 (Bern–Berlin 1995) 13–24

Schmidt P.L., "Die Studien in Deutschland zur humanistischen und neulateinischen Literatur seit dem ausgehenden 19. Jh.", in *La Filologia Medievale e Umanistica Greca e Latina nel Secolo XX. Atti del Congresso Internazionale Roma, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche Università La Sapienza 11–15 dicembre 1989*, vol. 1, Testi e Studi Bizantino-Neoellenici 7 (Rome 1993) 831–910

Schönert J., "Literaturgeschichte", in H. Fricke (ed.), *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*, vol. 2 (Berlin–New York 2000) 454–458

Smolak K., "Ovid im 13. Jahrhundert—zwischen Ablehnung und Bewunderung", in C. Leonardi – B. Munk Olsen (eds.), *The Classical Tradition in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Spoleto 1995) 111–122

———, "Latinistik der Mitte", in *Latein zwischen Antike und Neuzeit*, Wiener humanistische Blätter, Sonderheft (Vienna 1998) 32–46

Stotz P., "Zur Lage der Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters", in *Das Mittelalter. Perspektiven mediävistischer Forschung* 2, 2 (1997) 144–146

Uhlig K., *Theorie der Literarhistorie. Prinzipien und Paradigmen*, Britannica et Americana, third series, vol. 1 (Heidelberg 1982)

Vredeveld H., "Eobanus Hessus in Krakau", in G. Huber-Rebenich – W. Ludwig (eds.), *Humanismus in Erfurt* (Rudolstadt–Jena 2002) 161–176

White H., *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore 1973)

———, "Der historische Text als literarisches Kunstwerk", in C. Conrad – M. Kessel (eds.), *Geschichte schreiben in der Postmoderne. Beiträge zur aktuellen Diskussion* (Stuttgart 1994) 123–157

Wuttke D., *Deutsche Germanistik und Renaissance-Forschung. Ein Vortrag zur Forschungslage*, Respublica litteraria 3 (Bad Homburg–Berlin–Zurich 1968)

Ziolkowski J., "Die Mittellateinische Literatur", in F. Graf (ed.), *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie* (Stuttgart–Leipzig 1997) 297–322

"POSTERIORES SED NON DETERIORES": THE HUMANIST PERSPECTIVE ON LATIN LITERATURE AT THE END OF THE QUATTROCENTO AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS IN THE FRENCH RENAISSANCE

PERRINE GALAND-HALLYN

General Guidelines

Seen from a distance, the Italian Renaissance of the Quattrocento—in which I shall concentrate on the Florentine contribution—might be characterised in general terms by the tripartite structure that forms the basis of this book's programme: after a period of time (beginning, admittedly, in the thirteenth century), of intense rediscovery of ancient texts, the humanists of the first part of the Quattrocento, Poggio Bracciolini, Leonardo Bruni, Leon Battista Alberti, Lorenzo Valla and many others, focus on the dissemination, study and imitation of the great 'classical' models, as well as the 're-learning' of the Latin style cultivated by the ancients; the figure of Cicero dominates this 'civic' and philological humanism, whereas poetry seeks to redefine itself by following the example of Vergil, Ovid and the elegiacs, as well as Martial and the satirists; then, in the 1480s there is the arrival on the literary scene of Angelo Politian (Angelo Ambrogini, il Poliziano, 1454–1494)—educationalist, philologist and poet—who rebels (in imitation of the Hellenistic authors and of Quintilian, Statius and Tacitus) against the ever more prevalent Ciceronian and Vergilian purism and initiates the famous argument on 'Ciceronianism' by demanding eclectic imitation, the only means in his view of attaining to a more liberated individual written style. Availing of a broad-based intertextuality, acquired by means of particularly erudite philological studies, Politian the theoretician and poet also subscribes to a liberation from 'classical' rules, such as one finds in Horace, in the *Epistula to Piso (Ars Poetica)*: a refusal of generic constraints and of the notion of poetic decorum, a systematic loosening of structural organisation in the artistic work, the use of

a style that mimics the spoken language and suggests improvisation, a spontaneity that still reveals to the reader the rare erudition that informs—and sometimes obscures—the expression. In short, a remarkable 'modernity' which will create a school in Italy in the Quattrocento,[1] then, more especially, once it is taken over by Erasmus, in the rest of Europe in the following century, while not definitively ousting Ciceronianism, nor Vergilianism, which coexisted with it until the seventeenth century, even if the forms it took were often more 'flexible'.[2] This is actually an ongoing example of that cohabitation of the so-called 'phases' of Latin literature, but it is too well-known and too thoroughly investigated to merit further study now, and therefore I simply make reference to the works, for example, of M. Fumaroli, C. Mouchel and J. Lecointe, as well as to the collective work, *Poétiques de la Renaissance*.[3]

However, the theories of Politian on *imitatio* are clearly concomitant with a particular perspective on Latin literature which has been well

---

[1] Contemporaries (such as Pietro Crinito) and modern scholars alike view the year 1494 as a major historical turning-point, encompassing the invasion of Florence by Charles VIII, the seizure of power by Savonarola—putting an end to the flourishing Florentine humanism—and the deaths of Lorenzo de' Medici, Poliziano, Pico della Mirandola and their friend the Venetian Ermolao Barbaro. Subsequently, Bernardino Rucellai, founder of the Florentine "academy" of the Orti Oricellari in which Machiavelli participated, established the myth of the Medicean "golden age". See Gilbert F. , "Bernardo Rucellai and the Orti Oricellari: A Study on the Origin of Modern Political Thought", *The Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 12 (1949) 101–131 (Kraus reprint LTD, Vaduz 1965 ; article reprinted in *History, Choice and Commitment*, Cambridge Mass. – London 1977), and Galand-Hallyn P., "Les Miscellanées de Pietro Crinito: une philologie de l'engagement et du lyrisme", in D. de Courcelles (ed.), *Ouvrages Miscellanées et théories de la connaissance à la Renaissance*, Etudes et rencontres de l'Ecole des Chartes 12 (Paris 2003) 57–77.

[2] On Ciceronianism, see Mouchel C., *Cicéron et Sénèque dans la rhétorique de la Renaissance* (Marburg 1990) part 1, chap. 1. The principal theorists representing "Vergilian" poetics are Pontano (*Actius*), Vida (*Ars poetica*, 1527) and Scaliger (*Poetices*, 1561). The positions of Pontano and Vida are not, in fact, so far removed from the eclecticism of Poliziano, see Galand-Hallyn P., *Les yeux de l'éloquence. Poétiques humanistes de l'évidence* (Orléans–Caen 1995) part 3, chap. 2.

[3] Fumaroli M., *L'âge de l'éloquence. Rhétorique et "res litteraria" de la Renaissance au seuil de l'époque classique* (Geneva 1980) ; Fumaroli M., "Jules-César Scaliger et le 'schème historiographique' dans la *Poétique*", in C. Balavoine – P. Laurens (eds.), *La statue et l'empreinte. La Poétique de Scaliger* (Paris 1986) 7–17; Lecointe J., *L'idéal et la différence. Perception de la personnalité littéraire à la Renaissance* (Geneva 1993); P. Galand-Hallyn – F. Hallyn (eds.), *Poétiques de la Renaissance. Le modèle italien, le monde franco-bourguignon et leur héritage en France au XVIe siècle* (Geneva 2001).

analysed by the critics.[4] My starting point will be Politian's view of the Latin style cultivated by the ancients. I shall then briefly analyse its repercussions for Pietro Crinito (c. 1474/6 – c. 1507), his favourite pupil and posthumous editor, author of the first proper manual of Latin literature, the *De poetis latinis*, published in 1505 in Florence. Crinito in his turn influenced Vadianus (Joachim von Watt, 1484–1551), an important Swiss humanist and a pupil of Conrad Celtis, who taught in Vienna and was the mayor of St. Gallen, where he advocated a Lutheran policy. Vadianus, an excellent polygraph, is responsible for one of the first treatises on the art of poetry published in the Renaissance (Vienna, 1518).[5] I shall pay particular attention to the chapters in which Vadianus gives a detailed account of the history of Latin culture, and of medieval literature in particular, revealing a breadth of outlook rarely encountered at this time. Along the way—that is, as I examine the schematic historiography proposed by Crinito and especially Vadianus—I shall bring to light the influence that the theory of imitation exerted on their view of the past: the 'quintilianism' of these humanists entails a view of Latin literature as a single whole, almost uncontextualised temporally for Politian, while in continuous sequence for Vadianus.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Florentine heritage constitutes the foundation of the French Renaissance. For this period, the tripartite schematisation is less obvious: learning of the 'classics'—total command—'modernising' reaction, for the humanists rediscover the Latin past by adopting the 'classical' or 'modern' perspective on the past of the Italians, notably Politian, whose work has a particular impact in the first half of the century, and, is, in many respects, fundamental to the work of Erasmus and Guillaume Budé.[6] From the very beginning, however, Ciceronianism (with Christophe de Longueil and Etienne Dolet) is very close to Quintilianism, even if the latter

---

[4] Notably by Peter Godman, in an important article entitled "Poliziano's Poetics and Literary History", *Interpres* 13 (1993) 110–209.

[5] The Florentine Bartolomeo Fonzio (c. 1446–1513), colleague and rival of Poliziano, had written an earlier *De poetice* (between 1490 and 1492) inspired by the Neoplatonist C. Landino. It was circulated but not published, see *The Unknown Quattrocento Poetics of Bartolommeo della Fonte*, ed. C. Trinkaus (New York 1966) = *Studies in the Renaissance* 13 (1966) 95–122.

[6] On the influence of Poliziano on the beginnings of French humanism, see Galand-Hallyn P., with the collaboration of G.A. Bergère, *Un professeur-poète humaniste: Johannes Vaccaeus, La* Sylve Parisienne *(1522)* (Geneva 2002), and my edition in progress of the *Praelectio* and N. Bérauld's commentary on Poliziano's *Sylva Rusticus* (1513), which will appear with Droz (Geneva).

school must surely be seen to take precedence in poetic *practice* during the first half of the century with Germain de Brie, Jean Salmon Macrin and the epigrammatists, Bourbon, Ducher, Visagier and Dolet, the Ciceronian, himself.[7] It was the Pleiade manifesto of 1549, Du Bellay's *Defense et illustration de la langue francaise*, that distanced itself from the vernacular literature of the Middle Ages, while drawing on the Latin tradition to re-establish a typology of genres—a development that seems to inaugurate, in theory, at least, a return towards some kind of poetic 'classicism'. This return seems paralleled, on the Latin side, by the Vergilian *Poetique* of Scaliger, in 1561, and, more generally, by what J. Lecointe calls a 'Counter-reform' taking place in school rhetoric and in the recommended precepts for the practice of fine writing.[8] Nevertheless, the practice of Latin poetry (and very often that of vernacular poetry) by the authors of the second half of the century does not seem to demonstrate a genuine desire for a return to an earlier classical purism; on the contrary, several of them (Dorat, Du Bellay, Baif, Belleau, Jean Bonnefons and Etienne de la Boétie) seem to continue the aesthetic ideal on the Alexandrian model that characterises the first Erasmian phase, even if others, like Muret, Bèze (in their *Juvenilia*) or Michel de L'Hospital (in his Horatian *Carmina*), do perhaps attempt to revert to a more sober and traditional form of expression. These divisions remain nuanced and individual, linked to the genres concerned and to the particular context, and it seems difficult, in the present state of research (still fairly rudimentary), to evolve an overview of the Latin literature of the second French Renaissance. However, I shall look briefly at the scheme of historical development proposed by Scaliger and shall then contrast it with those of Politian, Crinito and Vadianus.

---

[7] On Neo-Latin literature in France, see Mururasu D., *La poésie néo-latine et la renaissance des lettres antiques en France (1500–1549)* (Paris 1928) ; Van Tieghem P., *La littérature latine de la Renaissance. Etude d'histoire littéraire européenne* (Geneva 1966 : first edition 1944) and my clarification in "Quelques aspects spécifiques du lyrisme néo-latin en France", plenary lecture (France) at the International Congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies, Bonn, August 2003 (forthcoming).

[8] Lecointe J., *L'idéal* (note 3) chap. 4.

From Politian to Vadianus: Eclectic Imitation and Historical Relativism

Politian (1454–1494): "Posteriores, sed non deteriores".

In 1480 when recently appointed professor of rhetoric and poetics at the Studio in Florence, Angelo Politian chose for his very first inaugural class to eulogise, quite provocatively (he himself emphasises the novelty of his intention), two authors previously regarded as minor: Quintilian and Statius.[9] As critics have clearly seen, such a choice amounted to the exclusion of the two author-models in prose and poetry, Cicero and Vergil, whose adulation might rather have been expected at the inauguration of this kind of professorship. Politian thus took up a position against the neo-Platonist, Cristoforo Landino, famed for his commentary on Vergil, and against the philologist, Domizio Calderini, who edited and commentated on Statius. To defend these positions, Politian sets out a relativist view of literary history, which he subtly supports by recourse to inter-textual dialogue between Cicero, Quintilian and Tacitus. From book 10 of the *Institutio oratoria*, in which Quintilian recommends to future orators his famous list of written texts, Politian retains and goes on to develop further the idea that chronology must be submitted to genre, category and the distinctive characteristics of the individual.[10] Moreover, these canons are liable to modification, as tastes and times evolve. If admiration for Statius is permissible, it is because, in his *Silvae*, he was able to show the full extent of his talent by applying it to a totally new literary genre, in which the sublime style is all brevity and virtuosity. In this way he has 'surpassed himself' in relation to his epic writings: 'To my opinion, he excelled himself in the same way as Vergil surpassed him in the other forms of poetry.'[11] Politian chooses, despite or because of his great prowess as a historian, to consider Latin literary history as a *supellex*,[12] a vast, portable store of cultural knowledge, to be viewed in terms of its inter-connections and complementary relationships, and to be used as the collector pleases, by culling what

---

[9] For this text, see Garin E., *Prosatori Latini del Quattrocento* (Milan–Naples 1953) 870–885. See also the analyses of Godman P. "Poliziano's" (note 4), and Bettinzoli A., *Daedaleum iter. Studi sulla poesia e la poetica di A. Poliziano* (Florence 1995) chap. 3.

[10] Godman P. "Poliziano's Poetics" (note 4) 131.

[11] Politian, *Laus Quintiliani*: 'Tam sese ipse, ut meum est iudicium, post se reliquit, quam eundem Virgilius Maro in superioribus antecesserat.' ed. E. Garin, *Prosatori* (note 9) 872–874.

[12] Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 8. 28: Godman P., "Poliziano's Poetics" (note 4) 138.

seems fruitful (following the advice of Quintilian), without reference to historical hierarchies. Thus, by praising Quintilian, the Florentine does not seek, as was thought on occasion, to oust Cicero, whom he admires, like his predecessors and whom he imitates himself in the composition of his *laus Quintiliani*: he is rather emphasising the complementarity of the two orators and showing how indispensable the reading of one is to the understanding of both. In this, as Godman has recalled,[13] Politian merely follows in the footsteps of Lorenzo Valla—and this indebtedness is sufficient in itself to show that the posited tripartite structure is not a relevant criterion. Furthermore, Politian the humanist (imitating the famous letter in which Poggio Bracciolini describes the discovery he made in St. Gallen in 1516 of Quintilian's complete manuscript) defends, in contradistinction to conformity with established canons, his right as a *grammaticus* to struggle against the *temporum culpa* (a concept also borrowed from Valla), to explore with the aid of his *iudicium* the least known and studied parts of the Latin cultural heritage and to 'revitalise' them. This enables him to come to a full expression of the relativism that he borrows both from Quintilian and from Tacitus, when he returns to the theme of the corruption of eloquence in the Flavian era:

> Finally, I do not even consider it worthwhile that eloquence in the century of these writers has been considered as degraded. For if we have a closer look, we will understand that it was neither degraded nor distorted. Rather, the art of speaking itself had changed and we ought not call anything worse just because it is different. Definitely, a greater care can be found in those secondary writers, a more intense delight, plenty of maxims, plenty of flowery passages none of them devoid of sense, no failings in composition. Certainly, all of them have not only written correctly, but they are strong, rich, lively, plenty of vigour and colour. For this reason, just as, without any contest, we assign in most aspects greatest authority to those supreme writers, we correctly maintain that in these other writers sometimes better and even stronger points exist.[14]

---

[13] Godman P., "Poliziano's Poetics" (note 4) 133–135.

[14] Politian, *laus Quintiliani*: 'Postremo ne illud quidem magni fecerim, quod horum scriptorum saeculo corrupta iam fuisse eloquentia obiciatur, nam si rectius inspexerimus, non tam corruptam atque depravatam illam quam dicendi mutatum genus intellegimus. Neque autem statim deterius dixerimus quod diversum sit. Maior certe cultus in secundis est, crebrior voluptas, multae sententiae, multi flores nulli sensus tardi, nulla iners structura, omninoque non tantum sani quam et fortes sunt omnes et laeti et alacres et pleni sanguis atque coloris. Quapropter ut plurima summis illis sine

Here one can see the influence of Tacitus in his *Dialogue on rhetorics* 18. 3, which is contrasted by Politian with the passage where Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 10. 1. 125 was treating of the 'decadence' and 'corruption' of Seneca:

> Nor does it at once follow that difference implies inferiority. It is the fault of envious human nature that the old is always the object of praise, the present of contempt.[15]

By his partial subscription to the 'modernist' position of Aper, the Florentine places himself in opposition to both the Ciceronians and the theories of decadence of Flavio Biondo and Leonardo Bruni, two humanists of the preceding 'phase'. Politian therefore emphasises, intentionally, diversity within continuity by rejecting the hierarchical model contained in Quintilian himself and the cyclical view of history that alternates grandeur with decadence.[16] The same attitudes can be found in one of his famous university *praelectiones* in verse form: the '*silva*' *Nutricia* (790 hexameters), delivered in the Studio in Florence in 1486. Politian's poetic reflection on the nature of poetry and inspiration is followed by a list of Greek and Latin poets from mythical to modern times, reminiscent of both Quintilian's book 10 and the *Laurea Occidens (Carmen bucolicum* 10) of Petrarch. The major or minor authors, classed according to genre, with scant attention to chronology, are usually designated by enigmatic periphrases that contain only picturesque biographical features and form a 'timeless unity'.[17] Politian, however, 'skips' the Middle Ages, moving from the ancient poets to Dante, Petrarch and Boccacio and finishing the catalogue with Cavalcanti, Lorenzo (Cosimo, his father, and Peter, his son) de Medici and the poet himself. Politian's approach can in this way be regarded as a quasi-refusal of literary history, in so far as this implies a division into phases and a canonical hierarchy.

---

ulla controversia tribuerimus, ita priora in his aliqua multoque potiora existere iure contenderimus.' Ed. E. Garin, "Prosatori" (note 9) 878.

[15] Tacitus, *Dialogus de oratoribus* XVIII. 3: 'Nec statim deterius esse quod diversum est, vitio autem malignitatis humanae vetera semper in laude, praesentia in fastidio esse.' Trans. A.J. Church and W.J. Brodribb, *A Dialogue on Oratory* (New York 1942).

[16] Godman P. "Poliziano's Poetics" (note 4) 144–145.

[17] Godman P., "Poliziano's Poetics" (note 4) 189.

Pietro Crinito (c. 1474–1507): 'virtù' against historiographic fatalism.

The *De poetis Latinis* of Politian's disciple, Pietro Crinito,[18] published first in Florence, with Giunta, in 1505, constitutes (although it had been preceded by the *Scriptorum illustrium Latinae linguae libri XVIII* of Sicco Polenton, composed between 1415 and 1438) the first genuinely 'modern' textbook of the history of ancient Latin poetry, inspired by the *De grammaticis et rhetoribus Latinis* of Suetonius. The work is divided into five books, corresponding to the great historical phases of antiquity. These books, which are in chronological order, are a collection of 94 chapters, each of which is devoted to an author: I. The origin of the Latin poets (from Andronicus to Novius, third—beginning of first century B.C.); II. From Lucretius and Catullus to Varro, Ist century B.C; III. From Vergil to Volcacius Sedigitus (from the principate to the reign of Nero and the beginning of the Silver Latin era); IV. From Statius to Vergilius Romanus (the Flavian and Antonine era); V. From Nemesianus to Venantius Fortunatus (Antonines in the Constantine—Theodosian centuries). Crinito explores biographical details and the authorship of works; he also formulates aesthetic judgements frequently supported by quotations. In his preface he differentiates himself from Sicco Polentone, denying any wish to be exhaustive, but seeking to exercise his *iudicium* in proposing authors of value. Discernable in this 'selection' is Politian's liking for minor writers and later ones, though Crinito adds archaic writers, who had less interest for Politian. At the time when Crinito is writing, his teacher's enemies dominate Florence, and as a humanist Crinito will never be able to establish himself at the Studio. This gives his treatise, like his other works (*De honesta disciplina*, 1504, *Poematum libri duo*, 1508) a rhetorical, even militant dimension: Crinito is at first opposed to the anti-humanism of Savonarola, then, like all the members of the Rucellai Academy, he seeks an amalgam of oligarchy and monarchy, at once rejecting tyranny and popular government; this tendency will culminate in the return to Florence in 1512 of the Medici family. A similar political overtone is discernable in the *De poetis latinis*: in each of the prefaces that precede the separate

---

[18] On Crinito, see Ludwig W., "Julius Caesar Scaligers Kanon neulateinischer Dichter", in W. Ludwig, *Litterae Neolatinae. Schriften zur neolateinischen Literatur* (Munich 1989) 220–241, esp. 222–223; Moss A., "Humanists and the Invention of Literary History", in R. Schnurr et al. (eds.), *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bariensis* (Tempe 1998) 411–418; and Galand-Hallyn P., "Les Miscellanées de Pietro Crinito" (note 1).

books, Crinito closely associates the flourishing of the literary scene with the wars and politics of the day. He considers that before 400 B.C. the Roman people was too pre-occupied by its conquests to have time to sing the conquests of its warriors (Preface I). In the time of Ennius, poets were scorned, until aristocrats became their protectors (Scipio of Ennius, Marius of Plautus, Laelius of Terence, etc.). It is under the principate and the Empire that Roman culture is at its most auspicious: 'together with the greatness of the Empire' (book 3, preface: *una cum maiestate imperii*):

> Then, as soon as some hope of reward inspires those who strive for some admirable deed, it is truly amazing how strongly mortal endeavor is wakened and incited continuously to lay hold of virtue. For this reason, when the Roman Empire was flourishing, the most brillant genii came in public life to the fore, not only in poetry but in all disciplines. When, during the following centuries, virtue became neglected, while human vices became more excited, the empire slowly collapsed and customs changed together with fortune's condition.[19]

Crinito acknowledges, like so many others, the principle of Roman grandeur followed by decadence. In the preface to book 5, devoted to the later Latin writers, he asks for the indulgence of the reader:

> Thus, men of learning will forgive me, when they read my book and see that we talk about poets who can justly be considered inferior and rather less refined than Paul, like Juvencus, Fortunatus and others of their kind. Personnally, I prefer to adopt a more moderate attitude. Because, with the change of religion, they also changed disposition and attractiveness of their poetry. One should not wonder about this. Notably, because the whole of Italy was troubled by all kind of great catastrophes, plundered and sacked by several tribes and barbarian nations, there is no wonder that the elegance and purity of the ancient writers was affected, neither that simultaneously ignorance and lack of practice in the belles lettres diminished. We should rather rejoice that in our times the honourable and liberal disciplines have culminated in such a way that they seem to emulate with Antiquity itself. Everyone, who read the works of Pontanus and Paulus Marullus attentively, will be in full

---

[19] Crinito, *De poetis Latinis*, Preface III: 'Nam ubi praemorium spes aliqua est illorum animis qui in praeclaro facinore intenti sunt, mirum profecto est, quantum excitentur indies atque accendantur studia mortalium ad capessendam virtutem. Quo factum est ut vigente Romani Imperii fortuna, clarissima ingenia in civitate praestiterint, non modo in facultate poetica sed in caeteris omnibus disciplines. Sequentibus deinde saeculis posthabita virtute, cum vitia hominum magis aestuarent, paulatim respublica delapsa enim in partem deteriorem et simul fortunae conditio cum moribus immutata est.' (Florence 1505) f. Bvi v°.

agreement with this assertion, because each of them (if I do not deceive myself) must be considered perfect in his genre.[20]

At the end of the quotation the influence of Politian is plain: Crinito justifies his favourable assessment of Pontano and Marullus[21] by stating that each is 'perfect in his genre' (*in suo genere absolutus*). Crinito the humanist follows his teacher in refusing a canon arranged in hierarchical order and in favouring variety and eclecticism. Crinito notes a degeneration of Latin linked to the barbarian invasions, yet exalts the excellent quality (*ad id accesserunt*) of his own time. However, he relates this evolution neither to a linear view of time nor to a genuinely cyclical perspective—that repetitive spiral that M. Fumaroli defines, like Franco Simone before him, as intrinsic to the idea of 'renaissance', although one can see that this is not always the case.[22] Crinito does not resort to a picture of organic development followed first by fruition and then by degeneration: for him it is the unforeseeable accidents of history that result in political change and hence ideological and cultural revision. The Empire gave rise to great poets, because the sovereigns themselves often cultivated the art of poetry:

> For, as soon as the Roman rulers had expanded the Empire and done deeds of renown, they took great care of poetry and paid tribute to it with incredible diligence. Octavius August, Germanicus Caesar and many others were delighted when employing themselves in these disciplines.[23]

---

[20] Crinito, *De poetis latinis*, Preface V: 'Itaque dabunt mihi veniam eruditi homines, qui cum legent hos libros, videbunt a nobis referri poetas illos, qui re vera Paulo ineptiores atque inelegantes haberi possunt, quales sunt Iuvencus, Fortunatus et alii generis eiusdem. In quo moderate me gessi, nam mutata religione mutarunt etiam indolem atque gratiam carminis, quo circa minime mirari oportet—praecipua cum universa Italia magnis atque variis cladibus confecta esset distrahentibus eam pluribus populis ac Barbaris nationibus—si antiquorum elegantia atque puritas violata est, et simul inscitia bonarum litterarum atque imperitia succrevit. Nostra vero tempestate magnopere debemus letari, quod ad id accesserunt honestae ac liberales disciplinae ut aliqua ex parte videantur cum ipsa antiquitate contendere. Quam rem facile probaturi sunt, qui Pontani opera et Marulli paulo attentius perlegerint: nam uterque (nisi ego forte in hac re decipior) in suo genere absolutus haberi debet.' (Florence 1505) f.Eiiii r°.

[21] Two rival authors whom Poliziano had no great liking for! Crinito's attitude was more open-minded.

[22] Fumaroli M., "Jules-César" (note 3) 7, who also refers to Simone F., *Il Rinascimento francese. Studi e ricerche* (Turin 1961) part 2, chap. 2, "Gli schemi umanistici nella storiografia francese del secolo XVII", 297–329.

[23] Crinito, *De poetis latinis*, General Preface: 'Siquidem Romani etiam principes aucto imperio et rebus clarissime gestis, magna cura incredibilique diligentia poeti-

If the *De poetis Latinis*, as opposed to Politian's *Nutricia*, displays a consciousness of history and its fluctuations, Crinito does not suggest determinism of any kind; he merely observes—clearly by way of advice to the Medicis, who have recently returned to power[24]—that the regime has a bearing on cultural productivity. In the fifth Preface, moreover, the Florentine points out that the disdain in which intellectuals of his time are still held has not deterred him from his erudite pedagogical project and that he is happy to bring this to completion in the hope of being useful and pleasing to his contemporaries. Crinito thus rules out fatalism where literature is concerned and simultaneously any definitive classification into good and bad stages of literary history, since the only ultimate important factors are initiative and individual talent. The idea that Latin literature has periods of special 'maturity' yields exemplars of a socio-cultural kind that are always potentially reproducible; each writer can draw on them as he pleases. Thus his works continually exalt as characters the ancient monarchs, who were enlightened, pacifist and liberal-minded (Augustus, Trajan, Hadrien, Antoninus, etc.), then, finally, Lorenzo il Magnifico, whose reign is mythologised as a veritable golden age. Deriving from a politically active and pragmatic humanism that will give rise to Machiavelli, Crinito envisages Latin literature as a rich and varied continuum, uneven, yet at every turn capable of being revitalised and brought to its *acme*, its highest level of achievement, by dedicated work, that is to say, *virtus*, which is ever liable, for the humanists of the Rucellai circle, to correct *fortuna*.

Joachim Vadianus (1484–1551).

Originating from St. Gallen, Joachim von Watt, otherwise known as Vadianus, a pupil of the famous humanist poet, Conrad Celtis, then himself *poeta laureatus* in 1514, doctor, historian, geographer, naturalist, and even theologian, contributed with his friend, Zwingli, to the establishment of the Lutheran division in Switzerland. Erasmus expressed his regard for him in a letter to Zwingli.[25] In 1512 Vadianus had been appointed professor of poetics at the University of Vienna. His teaching

---

cam coluerunt. Octavius Augustus, Germanicus Caesar et alii plures maxima animi voluptate in hoc disciplinarum genere versati sunt.' (Florence 1505).

[24] The collection is dedicated to Cosimo Pazzi, offspring of a rival family allied to the Medicis by marriage.

[25] *Opus Epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi Roderodami*, ed. P.S. Allen (Oxford 1906–1958) V, epist. 1314: September 1522.

gave rise to the *De Poetica et Carminis ratione*, published in 1518 in Vienna and one of the very first humanist works on poetics,[26] the precise influence of which is yet to be established and which is mentioned here by virtue of its interesting transitional status between the Florentine milieu of the end of the Quattrocento and the Erasmian humanism that was so all-defining in the North of Europe. Vadianus, who had travelled to Italy in about 1507 (Trento, Padua, Venice), had a very good knowledge of Italian humanism. This famous theologian from St. Gallen still receives very little critical recognition as a poetic analyst. For this reason I shall focus for a while on the detail of his historiographic ideas.

In his work on poetics, which is profoundly indebted to Quintilian despite its neo-Platonic apparel and is addressed to his young brother, Melchior, whom he frequently apostrophises, he devotes three chapters to the Greco-Latin cultural past: Chapter IV: 'Who were the oldest poets of the Greeks, treating also of Homer'; Chapter V: 'Who were the oldest poets in Latin, containing also the praise of Ennius and Vergil'; Chapter VI: 'On the continuous chronology of Latin poetry and its mutability and detriment during the centuries'.[27] As these three titles indicate, Vadianus's analysis emerges no less from a qualitative presentation based on his own personal *iudicium* than from chronological description. Here and there he mentions some of his exemplars: from the ancients Cicero, Quintilian, Eusebius, Diomedes and Macrobius, and from the modernising group, Despauteres and Crinito. In IV, after stating, in the manner of Eusebius, that the beginnings of Greek poetry are founded on an emulative imitation of the Hebrews,[28] he accepts as superior two great authors who are the sources of knowledge for each of the two field of study, David, and, following Quintilian (*Insti-*

---

[26] The poetics of Bartolomeo Fonzio, Poliziano's fellow student and rival, is still unpublished. That of Girolamo Vida was not published until 1527 (Rome). The treatises by Quinziano Stoa, *De Syllabarum quantitate epographiae sex*, Paris, 1511 (repr.) and Despauterius, *Ars uersificatoria*, Paris, 1516, are more strictly technical, and the *Poetica* of François Dubois (Paris, 1516) deals only with *dispositio*. The poetics of Vadianus can be read in the three-volume edition by P. Schäffer (Munich 1973–1977) t.1. See also Lecointe J., *L'idéal* (note 3) 336–337, and Galand-Hallyn P., *Poétiques* (note 3) 56n, 147n, 191–192 and n.

[27] Vadianus, *De Poetica* chapter 4: 'Qui vetustissimi apud Graecos Poetae, et inibi de Homero'; chapter 5: 'Qui vetustissimi apud Latinos Poetae, et inibi de Ennii et Maronis laudibus'; chapter 6: 'De Poetarum Latinorum successione in universum, et temporum varietate et iactura', Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 1:32–33 and 34–42.

[28] Vadianus, Chapter IV: 'Qui vetustissimi apud Graecos Poetae, et inibi de Homero', Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 32–33.

tutio oratoria 10), his Greek object of comparison, Homer. In book 5, he turns to the beginnings of Latin literature, which in his opinion is based on the imitation of Greek culture, just as the latter is founded on the emulation of the Hebrews, and gives a rapid account of the early poetic forms of Latin writers (Salic songs, verse oracles, symposiastic poems), while making poetry proper begin with Livy Andronicus. But the prize goes, without hesitation, to Ennius, '*alterum Homerum*', as well as to Vergil. Ennius, a sort of 'pre-humanist', is praised for his ascetic practices and his trilingualism (Greek, Oscan and Latin), for his expertise in epic as well as in satyr-plays, in comedy as well as in tragedy. This is an example of the aesthetic ideal of versatility, so prized by Politian and his followers. When Vadianus takes up the theme—a traditional one in critical writings—of the 'roughness' of Ennius' language (*humilis, asperius, rudia*), a surprising feature in a poet who was claiming to re-invent Homer, it is to remind his readers that judgements should remain relative and situated in context:

> For whoever would not pardon such an ancient epoch for these faults, when one considers that the origins of all great achievements are very difficult and, although they might seem rude, criticism is always easier than imitation.[29]

Vadianus recalls that the first Roman writers lived in a society more inclined to arms than study and that only drama focusing on civic themes could dispose them to love literature. Vadianus says, like Cicero before him, that if the poets who are *vetustiores* have been endowed with less *gratia* than their successors, it is because:

> Somehow, I do not know by what means, nature has ordained that it is not easy to practice things which are looked upon as new or uncommon.[30]

After the *vetustiores* come the *posteriores* who are considerably more *limatiores* and *cultiores*— a designation that encompasses all Latin authors until the principate. Vadianus then exalts Vergil, whom neither his antecedents nor his successors have been able to equal. It is Macrobius' judgement which the humanist from St. Gallen invokes to elevate

---

[29] Vadianus, *De Poetica* Chap. V: 'Quod quidem quis est qui aetati tam grandi non condonet, cum omnium rerum magnarum perardua principia sint, quae si rudia videantur, facilius sit carpere quam imitari.' Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 37.

[30] Vadianus, *De Poetica*: 'Natura ita semper nescio quomodo instituente, ut rebus quae aut novae aut insuetae existimantur, difficilis usus permittatur.' Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 37.

Vergil, as well as his idea of the *temperamentum* of styles. Vadianus is thus
clearly following Politian, with his taste for a learned variety of theme,
genre and style. Vadianus then rapidly summarises the ancient human-
ist debate on the allocation of precedence to Homer or Vergil, contrast-
ing Quintilian and Avitus with Stephanus of Byzantium, Tacitus, then
Propertius and others, evoking a poetic contest that he and his friend,
Peter Aperbach, had improvised on the subject,[31] and declaring him-
self in favour of Vergil, whose moral judgement and erudition are seen
to be unparalleled. Chapter 5 finishes, entirely naturally, with a tribute
to poetry in the German language, which, Vadianus, as a humanist,
is eager to associate with the three dominant cultures, Hebrew, Greek
and Latin.[32] Vadianus compares the moralists and religious writers to
the mythical poets, Orpheus, Amphion and Linus, whilst deploring the
practice of a profane, licentious type of poetry, which he links with Cal-
limachus and Philetas, and which he contrasts with the perfect com-
bination of piety and elegance achieved by Dante and Boccacio in
the vernacular. Thus, it is clear that in these two preliminary chap-
ters, Vadianus focuses his analysis of the past on major figures, David,
Ennius and Vergil, who are evidently already 'canonical', but to whom
he applies his own personal judgement: indeed, the three authors cho-
sen have the advantage of combining an aesthetic ideal of generic and
stylistic diversity (his predilection for this stemmed from the Quintil-
ian theory of *imitatio* devised by the Italians of the Quattrocento) with a
piety and a morality that were (in contradistinction to Homer) tried and
tested. This was a criterion never applied by Politian, whereas Crinito,
from a more political perspective, gave it greater relevance when defin-
ing the distinctive features of the poets. As for the historiographical
perspective, it is clearly subordinate here to the action of the *iudicium*.
In his sketch of Latin literary chronology, Vadianus definitely suggests
a qualitative evolution, from the *antiquiores* to the Empire via the *pos-
teriores*, and the linear process of *eruditio* is to all intents and purposes
a duplication of the theme of pedagogical improvement. Yet if those
who succeed can in some measure be considered logically superior to
the earliest writers, no blame must attach to the precursors—quite the
reverse, as the apologia for Ennius makes plain. Furthermore, while
the Latin world seems to be given clear preference over the Greek one
that precedes it, no comparison is made with the Hebraic world. As

---

[31] Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 40.
[32] Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 41–42.

for Germanic culture, which is included in the chronology by virtue of Vadianus's legitimate national pride, it exhibits qualities and defects that give it as much affinity with the earliest mythical stages of Greece as with the lax morality of the Hellenistic world. His humanist objectives do not allow the historiographical scheme to take precedence over the specific assessment of each author or group of authors.

The same rules of practice apply in chapter 6, in which Vadianus reverts to giving, in detail, a complete history of Latin literature, *in universum, et tempore varietate, et iactura*. The title itself is not without interest, as it pinpoints at the outset the idea of the continuity of Latin culture: *in universum*, even if this continuity incorporates fluctuations and occasional damage. The beginning of the text affirms this reading of the title. Vadianus compares the life of Latin, which is always subject to the changes of the centuries (*saeculorum alteratio*) and the troubles of the period (*temporum molestia*), to that of a plant that is ever vulnerable to weather variation, however hardy it may be (p. 43), and comments:

> This convinces me that the appreciation of the arts depends on the quality of custom and period just like the salubrity of the fruits depends on the quality of the air. [...] in happy and peaceful times, talent will be of more weight in topic as well as in authority and the perceptive mind will find more than enough room to develop itself. Whereas, in turbulent times, pested by war, I do not see what the leisure of those who love the Muses can have in common with the noice of arms.[33]

With the exception of Cicero (whom Guarino da Verona (1370/4–1460) considered to be quite the reverse in finding a challenge in civil discord), all the authors are vulnerable to the uncertainties of the age in which they live. Vadianus lists the factors that are liable to entrammel literary creativity: wars, political disturbances, the persistent errors of the people (*vulgi pertinaces errores*), jealousy of any form of beauty, and observes that it is understandable why Petrarch, like Horace, extolled creative solitude, hidden from the world (p. 44). Then, returning to his interest, as a humanist, in the earliest stages of Latin poetry and in the metaphor of the plant, he superimposes a comparative referent

---

[33] Vadianus, *De Poetica*, chap. 6: 'Hoc in promptu est, ut mihi persuadeam perinde artium aestimationem ex morum temporumque qualitate pendere ac frugum salutatem ex aere. (...) felicibus et pacatis temporibus ingenium artibus plurimum et loci et auctoritatis esse potest, satisque superque solers animus quo se exerceat occasionis habet, inquietis vero et distractis bello non video quid commercii ocium amantibus Musis cum armorum strepitu contingere queat.' Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 43–44.

that he says he found helpful in Despautere and some other *recentiores* (the authors of his own time), that of human life, divided into *infantia, adulescentia, aetas virilis, senectus*. Seneca and Florus (who are cited by Vadianus) had already had recourse to this image in their description of Roman history, and Prudentius also, in a panegyric.[34]

The *vetustiores*, whose strength is increasing, thus correspond to *infantia*. Vadianus, like Crinito before him, views them, untypically, with particular indulgence:

> […] they excelled by their great artfulness and shone beautifully by the gravity of the maxims and the weight of the words in their poems.[35]

He even grants them the *nitor*, and, like Quintilian, a certain manner of putting the finishing touches to their works, and, despite Horace's severe assessment of Lucilius and Persius' of the archaistic authors, he endorses the view taken by Vergil, who used to admit that he had collected the 'gold' in the 'silt' left by Ennius, that is, according to Vadianus, that he had found, beyond the *vetustatis duritiem* and the *incomptam dictionis asperitatem*, an exemplar which makes him *eruditior*. Reverting to a motif from the *Oratio* on Quintilian and Statius composed by Politian, this humanist therefore recommends:

> For this reason, all men of learning must not only be grateful to those writers who were so important and so admired in her own time, but they must also honour and study thoroughly whatever may have been fragmentarily left and found in other writers. Thus they may compensate with the duty of dear remembrance for all those entire works which were not allowed to reach us.[36]

and recalls that Cicero and Quintilian had themselves considered the *vetustissimi* orators useful. Hence he proposes to his brother:

---

[34] See Ludwig W., "Julius" (note 18) 221, who cites Häussler R., "Vom Ursprung und Wandel des Lebensaltervergleichs", *Hermes* 92 (1964) 313–341, and adds Pliny, *Epistula* 8. 12; and Vogt-Spira G. in the introduction to Iulius Caesar Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem, Sieben Bücher über die Dichtkunst*, vol. V, Books 6 and 7, edited, translated, explained and with an introduction by G. Vogt-Spira (Book 6)–L. Deitz (Book 7) (Stuttgart–Bad Cannstadt 2003) 27.

[35] Vadianus, *De Poetica*, chap. 6: '[…] excelluisse eos multa arte suisque in poematis gravitate sententiarum verborumque pondere pulchre emicuisse.' Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 45.

[36] Vadianus, *De Poetica*: 'Quam ob rem non solum gratias tam gravibus tamque receptis suis temporibus viris habere debent studiosi omnes, verum etiam si quid reliquiarum et fragmentorum apud scriptores passim inveniatur venerari et ediscere, ut officium saltem gratae memoriae his rependatur quorum opera pleniora ad nos usque pertinere non potuerunt.' Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 46.

> […] that, whenever you come across the monuments of Antiquity, you must consider them of equal worth as those things which merit appreciation by their own nature. For antiquity recommends many things, while it often also vitiates a lot. You must not drench yourself with the words and the harder use of antiquity for imitating them but to love them. Always the sense must be of more influence on you than the words.[37]

Vadianus, therefore, in defence of the *infantia* of Latin, adverts to the humanist debate on the necessity of the *ornatus* in rhetoric, exemplified in the famous exchange between Pico de la Mirandola and Ermolao Barbaro. Once the *res* is more important than the *verba*, the earliest stages of Latin literature cannot be scorned, but rather should be exploited and estimated at their true value by the *iudicium* of each reader, with special regard to their moral worth.

After the archaic age, Vadianus protracts the adolescence of Latin writing as far as the end of the Republic. The era of Lucretius, Decimus Liberius, Portius Licinius, Quintus Catulus, Catullus, Calvus, Helvius Cinna, etc. (all authors, according to this humanist, that Crinito places together in his Book II) is qualified as *vegetior aetas*[38] and is defined by the equal flourishing of literature and the free State. But the maturity of Latin literature, *aetas virilis*, coincides with the transition to Empire, for Vadianus remembers Crinito as he writes that the Caesars have themselves often wished to be famous poets. It is the age of Augustus that sees the culmination of this maturity: 'it is uncertain if this was the result of fortunated time or rather of his subtle politics or the greatness of his generosity and liberality',[39] since the renewal of peaceful conditions enabled Vergil, Horace, Propertius, Tibullus, Ovid, Manilius, Gallus, Titus Valgius, Cassius Severus, Emilius Macer and Caius Rabirius to devote themselves to the liberal arts.

Vadianus then interrupts his compilation of authors of the age of maturity (the reader is referred to Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 10 for additional authors) and reverts to the *iudicium* as sole frame of reference, awarding the prize to Cicero (in spite of Livy and Sallust) and to Vergil. This literary maturity, as with man himself, explains the writer from

---

[37] Vadianus, *De Poetica*: '[…] ut in antiquitatis monimenta incidens perinde quaeque aestimes atque ea quae suapte natura gratiam merentur: multa enim commendat vetustas ut saepe multa vitiat. Nec verba vetustatis aut duriorem usum ita imbibes ut imiteris sed ut ames, resque tibi semper verbis potior erit.' Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 47.

[38] Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 48.

[39] Vadianus, *De Poetica*: 'dubium an temporum casu an potius animi sui solertia, munificentiaeque et liberalitatis magnitudine' Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 48.

St. Gallen, will continue several years without losing any of its impe-
tus,[40] while even the princes—Germanicus, Tiberius, Nero, Vespasian,
up to Hadrian—attempted to win admiration by engaging in poetry.
Gradually, however, the Latin 'corpus' began to show some signs of
weakening, as early as the time of Nero, then in the Flavian era. The
generation of Claudian, Calpurnius and Nemesianus is still illustrious,
but of lesser appeal. The last wave of poets—Juvencus, Flavius Vopis-
cus, Prudentius, Fortunatus, Sidonius Apollinaris—continue to mani-
fest erudition in plenty, but the language itself is old, from this point
onwards.[41]

Vadianus's exceptionality will lie in his lengthy description (Politian
and Crinito 'skipped' this period pure and simply) of the 'decrepit mori-
bundity' of the Middle Ages (*decrepita et capularis annorum miseria*), and
resorts to every ingenuity to explain what this might possibly be. This
humanist firstly observes that Latin has become moribund because of
the linguistic intrusion of the enemies who overcame Rome, the Goths.
The civil wars experienced by Italy through the ages, however devas-
tating, had never endangered the Latin language, since it was spoken
in both camps: 'while the mutual enemies spoke the same language
with the same elegance'.[42] But the Goths and the Huns had nothing in
common with the Latin tradition and caused the destruction of the lan-
guage as well as of the manuscripts themselves. Another reason for the
senescence of Latin invoked by Vadianus (and previously by Crinitus):
it seemed difficult for Christians to reconcile their religion with pagan
culture[43] (p. 52). Lactantius, Augustine and Jerome were undoubtedly
right to defend this position when Christianity was threatened on all
sides. But, says Vadianus, now that the Church is victorious in Europe,
there should be no obstacle to the contemporary use of pagan poets.

Moreover, Vadianus is anxious to emphasise that at intervals even
during this era, 'learned and commendable works emerged, which had
not completely withered by the loss of elegance'.[44] He extols their writ-
ers, who 'were so passionate about poetry that they preferred to be
accused of negligence by writing badly than of laziness by not writing

---

[40] Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 49.
[41] Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 51.
[42] Vadianus, *De Poetica*: 'cum par hostibus lingua parque elegantia foret'. Schäffer
(ed.) (note 26) 51.
[43] Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 52.
[44] Vadianus, *De Poetica*: 'erudita et digna laude opera neque prorsus arita elegantia
desciscentia emerser⟨u⟩nt'. Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 52.

at all'.[45] As a humanist, he quotes and praises Raban Maurus (*elegantia, copia, mira arte et solertia*), whom he admires for his symbolic poems; Raban Maurus's private tutor, Bede (*concinnus, gratiosus*), two of whose psalms he discovered in the library of the abbey of St. Gallen; his pupil, Strabo, whose *Hortulus* Vadianus had copied for him, also in this library; Notker, whose sequences contain much graceful erudition and whose life of St. Gallen is also in Vadianus' possession; Aldhelm, whose epigrams and enigmas he is about to correct and publish; and especially Hrosvit, who had been edited a little earlier by his teacher, Conrad Celtis. His commentary on the works of the abbess is particularly representative of Vadianus' attitude to authors not normally considered to be part of the canon:

> Yet, although theses works are of barbarious nature, if you compare them with the ancients—I remember having heard this from Celtis himself— and if one keeps in mind sex, place and time, one can only wonder how a woman may have reached a similar skill in such a troublesome time. It is even more marvellous when one considers that in our time now that Latin flourishes, the learning of matrons and the unusual kind of such an eloquence evokes the highest admiration by all who have come to know her writings. […] I rejoice even more in writing these words now, my brother, that they may convince you truly of the truth of my precedent assertion: that poetry, when it is wakened by nature, is not entirely unfamiliar to the human mind, while she always links it to our obligatory occupations and, even in the worst miseries of our times, it uses to be our companion in order to console us.[46]

This humanist, who originates from St. Gallen, shows the same anxiety as his predecessor, Politian, to contextualise his judgements (*sexum, locum tempusque*). Above all, Vadianus expands the idea that the poetic *ingenium* is essentially a-temporal (*natura provocante*), and can never be stifled, even in the worst historic conditions. He corroborates this by quoting certain

---

[45] Vadianus, *De Poetica*: 'poeticae studiosi fuere, ut negligentiae accusari male scribendo maluerint quam omittendo desidiae.' Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 53.

[46] Vadianus, *De Poetica*: 'Quae tametsi Barbara sint si veteribus conferas, quod ex ipso me Celte audisse memoria teneo, tamen si quis sexum, locum tempusque animo colligat, mirari certe poterit unde haec muliebri animo solertia tam importuno tempore contigerit, maxime quod rerum linguae Latinae florente statu matronarum eruditio et insueta illa eloquentiae ratio summam cognoscentibus admirationem peperit […] Scribo haec hoc in loco, Frater, eo libentius ut illud tibi firmius persuadeas quod a me paulo ante assertum est: Poeticam natura provocante a mortalium animis non tam alienam esse, quin se semper necessariis occupationibus coniungat, summisque saeculorum aerumnis nobis quasi solaminis auctor comes esse soleat.' Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 54.

examples, laughable but touching because of their clumsy enthusiasm, including an epigram that he had been in a position to read himself in his youth in the church of Saint-Jacques at Villach, where he had taken refuge during a plague epidemic. He 'translates' the text, deemed almost illegible, to his brother, and comments:

> You will note, not without laughing, how this is expressed, by what kind of verse and by which observation of the syllables. And yet, you must be grateful to them, that they did not leave poetry, even though it was dying, and that they wanted to be considered as poets in a century in which there were almost none who deserved the title of poet.[47]

He goes on to quote Gualtherus (the song of Alexander), Corippe (the *Johannis*) and Dares, author of the Trojan song—a writer described as 'absolutissimus', and thus concludes a compilation that, all the same, he finds oppressive: 'For I cannot recall those times without some distaste and sadness.'[48] Vadianus finally likens the medieval period to the famous episode in which, during an invasion by the Gauls, Rome was saved by Camillus. This comparison then enables him to introduce the Renaissance, the proponents of which are tantamount to new Camilli,[49] thanks to whom 'the poets have been able to be recalled from their extreme old age', *revocatis ab extremo senio poetis*.

It is interesting to observe that once he has arrived at the pre-humanist period (Dante is the first to be quoted, although it is Petrarch who emerges as the first combatant against Barbarism), Vadianus sets aside the metaphor of the ages of life in preference to that of the war against ignorance.[50] Petrarch and Coluccio Salutati, the first combatants are still few in number and evince some traces of contamination by the Barbarians; Leonardo Bruni, Guarino of Verona and Lorenzo Valla, an *alter Camillus*, though too fastidious (the first half of the fifteenth century), portrayed as 'more audacious than victorious'; the poets, Francesco Filelfo and Joannes Ungherettus, more erudite than brilliant, then Maffeo Vegio, Gregorius Tifernas and Politian, flourishing at a time when there is a new lease of life for Latin writing,

---

[47] Vadianus, *De Poetica*: 'Quali autem versu, quantaque syllabarum observatione id expresserit, non sine risu cognosces. Et his tamen interim ages gratias quod extremum spiritum trahentem Poeticam non deserverint, quodque se videri Poetas volverint eo saeculo quo fere nulli erant qui Poetae nomine digni essent.' Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 55.

[48] Vadianus, *De Poetica*: 'nam non sine fastidio quodam et maerore talium temporum reminiscor.' Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 56.

[49] Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 56.

[50] Schäffer (ed.) (note 26) 57.

succrescente iterum re Latina. The *recentiores*, Marullo, Pontano, Valeriano, Battista Spagnoli, Antonio Sabellico, Eliso Calentio, the Strozzi and Fausto Andrelini make up the last wave of Italian humanists, while, to conclude, Vadianus gives a list of the humanists from Germania.

Chapter VI is thus noteworthy for the continuity that it records. Vadianus adopts the metaphor of the ages of life, but in contrast to what Scaliger, for example, will do, he does not insist on cyclical development. Here is the great body of Latin culture, still babbling at the outset of the Republic, adolescent in the first century B.C., in full maturity with Cicero and the Augustan era, then, under the Empire a little short of breath, ageing in Late Antiquity, in dire straits in the Middle Ages, though not quite dying, and finding a resurgence of strength in the Renaissance. The humanist phase is not subject, as it will be with Scaliger, to the cycle's continuity, the Renaissance being described rather as a fight progressively won against the effects of Barbarism. The repeated communication with his young brother makes the treatise more immediate and pedagogical and also enables Vadianus to emphasise the importance of a certain moral standpoint, even with regard to historiographical differentiation. No effort ever deserves scorn: the intention counts for almost as much as the result. This is again reminiscent of the positive attitude and the didactic principles of Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria* books 1 and 12, especially). The use of metaphor helps to give an epic dimension to the adventures of the allegorised Latin language. The recapitulation of the joys and calamities of this great organic entity emphasises above all its resilience and its capacity to resist attack, even when its fortunes are at their worst. This heroic constancy, this innate faith in poetry, which subsumes every form of culture, binds together the different phases of humanity and is its own justification for the humanist work of rediscovering the texts of the past, as exemplified by the anecdotes in which Vadianus describes his own activities as an epigrapher or philologist.

French Humanism: From the Viewpoint of Continuity
in Latin Literature to the Revival of Canonical Phases

The French Renaissance will be built on analogous certainties, through the influence of Politian's works and those of his successors, which were rapidly disseminated. The intellectual circles in Paris and Lyons were dominated by Budé and his group of friends, such as the humanist,

Nicolas Bérauld, the printer from Ghent, Josse Bade and the great poet, Jean Salmon Macrin (1490–1557), all influenced by Erasmus' thought, who was himself dependent on Politian.[51] They will be concerned, in the first decades of the sixteenth century, with the publication of various authors, irrespective of the particular epoch (we are well aware that in the vernacular domain, likewise, the admiration that Marot and the poets of his generation had for certain great medieval texts integrates well with the humanistic erudition that is continually being discovered in their writings). They will also focus on developing the theory and practice of a poetics of imitation and eclectic assimilation, after the manner of their Italian predecessors.

From 1528, however, with the publication of Erasmus's *Ciceronianus* (which, in a Christian perspective, is emphatically in favour of the doctrine of variety and eclecticism in the choice of language and examples, and against those who consistently support Ciceronianism), the debate is resumed with increased vigour, although, in poetic practice, including that of a staunch Ciceronian like Etienne Dolet, there is no real change in the customary view of Latin literature as a *supellex*, from which each person can draw as he pleases the elements necessary to construct a style that is correctly 'mixed' according to his individual *ingenium*. The 'silva' inherited from Statius or the *Carmina* from Horace, and the epigram, whether from Catullus or Martial, offer frameworks suitable for the remarkable development of a type of poetry relating to circumstance and to individuality, which comes to be diffused throughout Europe.

From the middle of the century, however, there is a reaction to eclecticism and a return to more 'classical' tendencies,[52] at least, where theoreticians are concerned, as the practice of poetry, in Latin, and even in the vernacular, remains profoundly influenced by the theories advocating *varietas*. It is not possible here to give a proper description of a phenomenon that has as yet received very little attention; the Neo-Latin side, at least, is still hardly investigated. One or two observations might, however, be tentatively made.

---

[51] See the introduction to Galand-Hallyn P., *Un professeur-poète* (note 6), as well as Galand-Hallyn P., *Poétiques* (note 3).

[52] I refer to Lecointe J., *L'Idéal* (note 3) chap. 4, "Le système des Belles–Lettres", especially section 2, "L'assimilation du cicéronianisme par la tradition scolaire française", 469–572; to Galand-Hallyn P., *Poétiques* (note 3) particularly the chapters on inspiration and style; and to the recent thesis of Chevrolet T., *L'idée de poésie. Néoplatonisme et théorie littéraire à la Renaissance*, [doctoral thesis], University of Geneva, 2004.

Several factors are likely to have impelled the humanists to revert to a more normative system. French schools, as J. Lecointe has suggested, 'have difficulty in following the development of Erasmus's thought to its conclusion, as he attempts to "personalise" rhetoric; they are inevitably attracted to the alternative Ciceronian pedagogical model' (p. 524). With these teachers, however, what is involved is a more flexible, 'ethical' Ciceronianism, and the Erasmian concern to specify the nature of personal *genius* goes no further than the *genius loci*, that is, national identity, with, central to the celebration of this, the concept of 'naïveté' (p. 528). For the impassioned affirmation of national identity is now the prevailing tendency, as shown by the challenging *Defense et illustration de la langue francaise* of Joachim du Bellay, published in 1549. The Pléiade is not quite accurate when it claims to be the first to fuse humanist knowledge with French creativity, and the most recent works on Marot and his generation reveal, on the contrary, how close the vernacular writers of the first half of the sixteenth century were to their humanist friends and colleagues or Latin-speaking poets. Yet clearly, the concern to claim novelty and originality leads to a re-reading of ancient poetry, much more concerned with matters such as generic taxonomy. In the *Defense*, chapter 2. 4, entitled, "What are the poetic genres to be chosen by the French poet?", Du Bellay urges his reader to abandon the 'old French forms of poetry'—rondos, ballads, virelays, odes for royalty, songs, and 'other such plain fayre'—in order to 'devote themselves wholeheartedly' 'to those epigrams that please' in the style of Martial, to 'touching elegies after the manner of Ovid, Tibullus or Propertius', to the odes as yet unknown of the French Muse, to epistles in the vein of Horace or Ovid.[53] Clearly, renewal of interest in generic taxonomy results, in particular, from the desire to establish a contrast between traditional French forms and 'modern' literary genres and to combine vernacular language with ancient classical typology (the authors mentioned are the writers of the Augustan period with the exception of Martial). In practice, it can be seen that while a poet like Muret, in his *Juvenilia* (1552), seems to attempt, in line with the *Defense*, to reformulate, by imitating the classics, a precise definition of each poetic genre,[54] Du Bellay himself, who has reverted without com-

---

[53] J. Du Bellay, *La Defence et Illustration de la Langue Francoyse*, ed. H. Chamard, intr. J. Vignes (Paris 1997) 107–118.

[54] See, on this matter, the forthcoming thesis (Paris III) of V. Leroux at Droz (Geneva).

punction, at the time of his stay in Rome (1553–1558) to the bi-lingual practice of poetry, composes poems which bear the imprint of the eclectic theories current at the beginning of the century, and blithely merges classical and later Latin models, in a richly Alexandrian style.[55] One should also take cognizance of those re-readings of Horace—in progress since the very beginning of the century—that were concerned with the enigmatic *Epistula to Piso*. This would reveal (despite examples like Peletier du Mans, who translated and admired a normative Horace) more flexible interpretations, with a greater awareness of the essentially Horatian dichotomy between poetic theory and practice.[56] The poetry of Michel de L'Hospital in his *Carmina*, verse epistles, written in the style of Horace (posth. ed. 1585 and 1732), is still deeply imbued with the preceding aesthetic viewpoint. The influence of Aristotle's *Poetics*,[57] published at the end of the fifteenth century, but only brought into the reckoning in the post-1548 years, made a significant contribution, as we know, to this partial revival of classical theories in the Renaissance.[58] There, too, a systematic study of the Neo-Latin and French poetic corpus of the second half of the sixteenth century would bring to light considerable disparities, particularly after the outbreak of the wars of religion, which kindled enthusiasm for emotionally expressive literary models of the Ovidian tradition, written in the age of Nero or later.

To conclude, I shall simply mention rapidly—for it has already been the subject of detailed research, in particular, by W. Ludwig, M. Fumaroli and G. Vogt-Spira[59]—the historiographic model established by the Ciceronian and Aristotelian scholar, Jules-César Scaliger, in his *Poétique*, published posthumously in 1561, and recently edited by L. Deitz and G. Vogt-Spira. In chapter 1 of book 6 (*Hypercriticus*), anticipated by the first chapter of book 1 (*Historicus*) and by book 5 (*Criticus*),[60]

---

[55] See Galand-Hallyn P., *Le "Génie" latin de Joachim Du Bellay* (La Rochelle 1995).

[56] See Galand-Hallyn P., "'Médiocrité' éthico-stylistique et individualité littéraire", in E. Naya – A.-P. Pouey-Mounou (eds.), *Eloge de la médiocrité. Le juste milieu à la Renaissance* (Paris 2005) 103–120.

[57] 1498: Latin tr. by Giorgio Valla ; 1508: *editio princeps*, in *Rhetores Graeci*, Venice, Aldus Manutius.

[58] See the excellent account of Chevrolet T., *L'idée de poésie* (note 52), some of whose conclusions could nevertheless be refined somewhat.

[59] See Ludwig W., "Julius" (note 18); Fumaroli M., "Jules-César" (note 3) ; Vogt-Spira G., introduction to Iulius Caesar Scaliger (note 34).

[60] See the French edition of book 5: J.-C. Scaliger, *La Poétique, livre V, le Critique*, ed. and trad. by J. Chomarat (Geneva 1994).

Scaliger summarises his view of the evolution of Latin literature. He begins by rejecting the quadripartite, non-cyclical model of the four ages of the world: the golden age, the silver age, the bronze age and the iron age, which would place the humanist era at the final stage of the sequence, in a time of irremediable decline. Like Vadianus, and others before him, Scaliger employs the metaphor of the ages of life, for it has the benefit of suggesting a possible renewal from generation to generation,[61] while removing the fatalism implicit in a linear sequence leading to decadence, like that of the ages of the world. In contrast to Vadianus, however, who, as we have seen, posits the permanence of a unique 'body', subject to a succession of ages and vicissitudes as child, adolescent, adult and old person, though subsequently revived and rejuvenated, Scaliger chooses a pattern of recurring five-phase life cycles, with the first cycle taking place during Antiquity. Corresponding with *infantia* is the time of Livy Andronicus and Ennius, while *adolescentia* is the epoch of Accius, Naevius and Plautus (the two ages are sometimes confused in other passages). Terence, Catullus, Tibullus and Horace represent the flower of the iuventus, with Vergil, of course, its most accomplished exponent. Then literature in the time of Nero and Flavius shows some measure of decline, while old age sets in with the arrival of Late Antiquity: Serenus, Sidonius, Boethius, Ausonius and Claudian. The Middle Ages, in contrast to Vadianus, are said to be a long death, and are not studied by Scaliger. Then the life cycle resumes with Petrarch, the age of a *nova pueritia*, which gives way, under Filelfo, to a second *adolescentia (clara incrementa)*, then to a new maturity (*iuventus*), capable of matching the ancients, with the exception of Vergil: Palingenus (who later changes category), Aonius Palearius, Politian, Paulus Cerratus, Vida, Pontano, Sannazaro and Fracastoro, to whom Scaliger adds Bembo in the course of the book, as well as, in a sub-category apart, forty five poets of lesser rank. The rest of the Chapter is devoted to a detailed, frequently acerbic, application of the humanist *iudicium* to these various categories, which are occasionally slightly modified. Vadianus, influenced by both neo-Platonism and Quintilianism, strove to unite (perhaps by affectionate inclination) the ancient Hebrew, Greek and Latin poets, as well as the middle-Latin, then humanist poets, into a single whole—ideal and all-embracing, poetic and spiritual. Scaliger, on the other hand, makes ruthless selections: the Greeks—that is, the

---

[61] Fumaroli M., "Jules-César" (note 3) 15.

mythical poets, Homer (brilliant but inartistic—and rivalling Vergil!),
in addition to all the others, are instantly disqualified, just like the
earliest stages of Latin poetry, because of what Fumaroli describes
as 'a perfectly logical scorn for periods of inception, gestation and
inchoateness' and also on account of this Aristotelian scholar's disin-
clination for confusions between theology and poetics and his predilec-
tion for epochs characterised by highly developed technical skill.[62] The
Romans, coming after the Greeks, have been able to benefit from their
heritage and to perfect it, and the ultimate purpose of this human-
ist, the demonstration of Vergil's supremacy, is thus fulfilled. Erasmus
and the anti-Ciceronians (who are based on a Horace only envis-
aged here—not wholly accurately—as critic of a 'servile flock' of imi-
tators) are, for Scaliger, the 'Vergilian', the new 'Barbarians', to be
combated by the re-establishment of strict canons where the imita-
tion of models is concerned, as well as composition and self-censorship
(book 5, chapter 1). Similarly, as W. Ludwig observes,[63] Scaliger resorts,
in his selection of the best Neo-Latin authors, to implicit criteria. To
make his selection, he undoubtedly re-establishes a traditional hier-
archy of genres (also evident in Book III, 95 ff.), in which the *epos*
returns to the top of the hierarchy, and Neo-Latin theatre and lyri-
cism are discarded. A further implicit criterion could well be Scaliger's
nationalism, as an Italian exiled to France.[64] The eight authors of
the Scaliger canon are Italian, the very great Neo-Latin French poet,
Salmon Macrin, who was pre-eminent in Marot's generation, not even
receiving a mention. The great German poets like Conrad Celtis and
Eobanus Hessus are ignored, as is the Dutchman, Johannes Secundus,
and, indeed, the Scotsman, George Buchanan. Ultimately, Scaliger the
doctor, who considered himself Veronese, awards the accolade to a fel-
low townsman, Fracastor, for his epic on *Syphilis* (1530). The highly per-
sonal and polemic character of Scaliger's *Poetics* has prompted some
critics to query his historic significance. Echoing the doubts of M.
Simonin and M. Fumaroli, Luc Deitz, in his introduction to Volume I
of the modern edition, concludes that, despite his renown, the influ-
ence of Scaliger's work has remained superficial: his name is very often
quoted for its authority as a critic, but his theoretical approach is
never strictly applied—or at any rate inaccurately, and only to very

---

[62] Fumaroli M., "Jules-César" (note 3) 12.
[63] Ludwig W., "Julius" (note 18) 239.
[64] Ludwig W., "Julius" (note 18) 239.

specific or very general questions. Deitz considers that the famous 'Scaligerism' so often mentioned in relation to European literature has never existed.[65]

The few lines of enquiry indicated here do not seem to provide any substantial conclusion in the context of the theme for the present interchange of ideas. Therefore I shall merely recapitulate some observations:

– It is ultimately quite difficult to isolate, in the Italian Renaissance of the Quattrocento, clearly delineated phases. Broadly anticipated by previous Renaissances, and notably, in the sixteenth century, by the work undertaken at the school of Padua, and by Petrarch, the humanism of the fifteenth century shows only one clear division in the development of theoretical ideas, when, in the 1480s, Politian launches his aesthetic theory of 'anti-Ciceronianism' and advocates a type of poetry founded on variety, individuality and freedom from normative prescription, basing his ideas on a comprehensive and deliberately a-historic view of ancient culture. If the Middle Ages is given no share in the list of poets in his 'silva', *Nutricia*, the study of his practice in prose and in verse shows the substantial presence of medieval models.[66] After Politian, Crinito, like Vadianus, will still be particularly sensitive to the individual, militant dimension of an eclectic approach to ancient culture, conceived as an integrated whole and structured as a chronological sequence with a more or less unifying effect, despite the historical uncertainties responsible for occasional phases of degeneration in the Latin language. The emphasis, in Crinito, is on the ideological solidarity of those who defend fine writing, in Vadianus, on a sort of human fraternity bridging the rift between paganism and Christianity.

– At the time of the transmission, in the sixteenth century, of the Italian heritage to French humanism, the ideas of Politian, passed on by Erasmus, will become widely influential, providing an ideal that is free from canonical norms and gives precedence to the individuality of the writer.

---

[65] L. Deitz, Introduction to book 7 (note 34) LXII.

[66] See e.g. the edition by J.M. Mandosio due to be published with Droz of his *Panepistemon, praelectio* summarising the broad areas of knowledge: *Polizianos's Panepistemon*, doctoral thesis, Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes, Sciences historiques et philologiques (Geneva 1998).

While remaining distinct from the Dutch humanist's idea of *philautia* that produced such unease, it will be placed in the service of spirituality, which had not hitherto been the case in many spheres of influence in Italy. This ideal, preserved by conservative parliamentary circles, will retain its initial form in poetic practice until the end of the century. Nevertheless, from the earliest stages of the French Renaissance, with a humanist like Etienne Dolet, for example, Ciceronianism will continue to have remarkable success, especially with theoreticians and pedagogues, and in combination with a revival of Aristotelianism, will produce, towards the middle of the century, a renewal of interest, for both Latin and vernacular writers, in the authors and generic hierarchies of ancient Latin 'classicism', with the *Poetics* of Scaliger in the vanguard. It would be desirable to make a systematic, detailed study of the effects on the practice of written Latin (in contrast to vernacular works), of this so-called theoretical 'classicism', by taking a fresh look at these same terms. Just as the specific idea of 'Ciceronianism' has been very well analysed by T. Tunberg,[67] who has shown its imprecision (starting with the philological viewpoint—for the way the humanists pictured Ciceronian Latin was fluid, varying and often very different from the perceptions of modern editors), and the notion of ancient 'classicism' has been challenged and called into question here by Gregor Vogt-Spira. This interchange of ideas should therefore enable us, in addition, to make progress in the precise evaluation of humanist literary movements.[*]

Select Bibliography

Primary Sources

CRINITO P., *De poetis Latinis* (Florence 1505)

FONZIO B. *De poetice* (between 1490 and 1492), in *The Unknown Quattrocento Poetics of Bartolommeo della Fonte*, ed. C. Trinkaus (New York 1966) = *Studies in the Renaissance* 13 (1966) 95–122

POLIZIANO A. *Praelectio super F. Quintiliano et Statii Sylvis*, in Garin E., *Prosatori Latini del Quattrocento* (Milan-Naples 1953) 870–885

——, *Silvae*, ed. F. Bausi (Florence 1996)

---

[67] Tunberg T.O., "Ciceronian Latin: Longolius and the others", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 46 (1997) 13–61.

[*] I am very grateful to James Mearns and Wim Verbaal for their support in translating this paper.

Scaliger J.-C., *Poetices libri septem, Sieben Bücher über die Dichtkunst*, vol. V: Books 6 and 7, eds. G. Vogt-Spira (Book 6) – L. Deitz (Book 7) (Stuttgart–Bad Cannstadt 2003)

Vadianus I. (Von Watt J.), *De Poetica et carminis ratione* (Vienna 1518), ed. P. Schäffer (Munich 1973–1977)

Secondary Literature

Bettinzoli A., *Daedaleum iter. Studi sulla poesia e la poetica di A. Poliziano* (Florence 1995)

Fumaroli M., *L'âge de l'éloquence. Rhétorique et "res litteraria" de la Renaissance au seuil de l'époque classique* (Geneva 1980)

———, "Jules-César Scaliger et le 'schème historiographique' dans la *Poétique*", in *La statue et l'empreinte. La Poétique de Scaliger*, ed. C. Balavoine – P. Laurens (Paris 1986) 7–17

Galand-Hallyn P., *Le "Génie" latin de Joachim Du Bellay* (La Rochelle 1995)

———, *Les yeux de l'éloquence. Poétiques humanistes de l'évidence* (Orléans-Caen 1995)

———, with the collaboration of G.A. Bergère, *Un professeur-poète humaniste: Johannes Vaccaeus, La* Sylve Parisienne *(1522)* (Geneva 2002)

———, "Les Miscellanées de Pietro Crinito: une philologie de l'engagement et du lyrisme", *Ouvrages Miscellanées et théories de la connaissance à la Renaissance*, ed. D. de Courcelles, Etudes et rencontres de l'Ecole des chartes 12 (Paris 2003) 57–77

———, "'Médiocrité' éthico-stylistique et individualité littéraire", in *Eloge de la médiocrité. Le juste milieu à la Renaissance*, ed. E. Naya – A.-P. Pouey-Mounou (Paris 2005) 103–120

———, "Quelques aspects spécifiques du lyrisme néo-latin en France", plenary lecture (France) at the International Congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies, Bonn, August 2003 (forthcoming)

Galand-Hallyn P.–Hallyn F. (eds.), *Poétiques de la Renaissance. Le modèle italien, le monde franco-bourguignon et leur héritage en France au XVIe siècle* (Geneva 2001)

Gilbert F., "Bernardo Rucellai and the Orti Oricellari: A Study on the Origin of Modern Political Thought", *The Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 12 (1949) 101–131 (Kraus reprint LTD, Vaduz, 1965); reprinted in *History, Choice and Commitment* (Cambridge Mass.– London 1977)

Godman P., "Poliziano's Poetics and Literary History", *Interpres* 13 (1993) 110–209

Häussler R., "Vom Ursprung und Wandel des Lebensaltervergleichs", *Hermes* 92 (1964) 313–341

Lecointe J., *L'idéal et la différence. Perception de la personnalité littéraire à la Renaissance* (Geneva 1993)

Ludwig W., "Julius Caesar Scaligers Kanon neulateinischer Dichter", in id., *Litterae Neolatinae. Schriften zur neolateinischen Literatur* (Munich 1989) 220–241

Moss A., "Humanists and the Invention of Literary History", *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bariensis*, ed. R. Schnurr et al. (Tempe 1998) 411–418

Mouchel C., *Cicéron et Sénèque dans la rhétorique de la Renaissance* (Marburg 1990)

MURURASU D., *La poésie néo-latine et la renaissance des lettres antiques en France (1500–1549)* (Paris 1928)

TIEGHEM P. van, *La littérature latine de la Renaissance. Etude d'histoire littéraire européenne* (Geneva 1966: first edition 1944)

TUNBERG T.O., "Ciceronian Latin: Longolius and the others", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 46 (1997) 13–61

INDEX NOMINUM

BRILL'S STUDIES
IN
INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

Edited by A.J. Vanderjagt

79. BINKLEY, P. (ed.). *Pre-Modern Encyclopaedic Texts.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10830 0
80. KLAVER, J.M.I. *Geology and Religious Sentiment.* The Effect of Geological Discoveries on English Society and Literature between 1829 and 1859. 1997.
    ISBN 90 04 10882 3
81. INGLIS, J. *Spheres of Philosophical Inquiry and the Historiography of Medieval Philosophy.* 1998. ISBN 90 04 10843 2
82. McCALLA, A. *A Romantic Historiosophy.* The Philosophy of History of Pierre-Simon Ballanche. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10967 6
83. VEENSTRA, J.R. *Magic and Divination at the Courts of Burgundy and France.* Text and Context of Laurens Pignon's *Contre les devineurs* (1411). 1998. ISBN 90 04 10925 0
84. WESTERMAN, P.C. *The Disintegration of Natural Law Theory.* Aquinas to Finnis. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10999 4
85. GOUWENS, K. *Remembering the Renaissance.* Humanist Narratives of the Sack of Rome. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10969 2
86. SCHOTT, H. & J. ZINGUER (Hrsg.). *Paracelsus und seine internationale Rezeption in der frühen Neuzeit.* Beiträge zur Geschichte des Paracelsismus. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10974 9
87. ÅKERMAN, S. *Rose Cross over the Baltic.* The Spread of Rosicrucianism in Northern Europe. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11030 5
88. DICKSON, D.R. *The Tessera of Antilia.* Utopian Brotherhoods & Secret Societies in the Early Seventeenth Century. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11032 1
89. NOUHUYS, T. VAN. *The Two-Faced Janus.* The Comets of 1577 and 1618 and the Decline of the Aristotelian World View in the Netherlands. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11204 9
90. MUESSIG, C. (ed.). *Medieval Monastic Preaching.* 1998. ISBN 90 04 10883 1
91. FORCE, J.E. & D.S. KATZ (eds.). *"Everything Connects": In Conference with Richard H. Popkin.* Essays in His Honor. 1999. ISBN 90 04 110984
92. DEKKER, K. *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies in the Low Countries.* 1999.
    ISBN 90 04 11031 3
93. ROUHI, L. *Mediation and Love.* A Study of the Medieval Go-Between in Key Romance and Near-Eastern Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11268 5
94. AKKERMAN, F., A. VANDERJAGT & A. VAN DER LAAN (eds.). *Northern Humanism between 1469 and 1625.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11314 2
95. TRUMAN, R.W. *Spanish Treatises on Government, Society and Religion in the Time of Philip II.* The 'de regimine principum' and Associated Traditions. 1999.
    ISBN 90 04 11379 7
96. NAUTA, L. & A. VANDERJAGT (eds.) *Demonstration and Imagination.* Essays in the History of Science and Philosophy Presented to John D. North. 1999.
    ISBN 90 04 11468 8
97. BRYSON, D. *Queen Jeanne and the Promised Land.* Dynasty, Homeland, Religion and Violence in Sixteenth-Century France. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11378 9
98. GOUDRIAAN, A. *Philosophische Gotteserkenntnis bei Suárez und Descartes im Zusammenhang mit der niederländischen reformierten Theologie und Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts.* 1999.
    ISBN 90 04 11627 3
99. HEITSCH, D.B. *Practising Reform in Montaigne's* Essais. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11630 3
100. KARDAUN, M. & J. SPRUYT (eds.). *The Winged Chariot.* Collected Essays on Plato and Platonism in Honour of L.M. de Rijk. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11480 7
101. WHITMAN, J. (ed.), *Interpretation and Allegory:* Antiquity to the Modern Period. 2000.
    ISBN 90 04 11039 9
102. JACQUETTE, D., *David Hume's Critique of Infinity.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11649 4
103. BUNGE, W. VAN. *From Stevin to Spinoza.* An Essay on Philosophy in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12217 6
104. GIANOTTI, T., *Al-Ghazālī's Unspeakable Doctrine of the Soul.* Unveiling the Esoteric Psychology and Eschatology of the Iḥyā. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12083 1
105. SAYGIN, S., *Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (1390-1447) and the Italian Humanists.* 2002.
    ISBN 90 04 12015 7
106. BEJCZY, I., *Erasmus and the Middle Ages.* The Historical Consciousness of a Christian Humanist. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12218 4
107. BRANN, N.L. *The Debate over the Origin of Genius during the Italian Renaissance.* The Theories of Supernatural Frenzy and Natural Melancholy in Accord and in Conflict

on the Threshold of the Scientific Revolution. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12362 8

108. ALLEN, M.J.B. & V. REES with M. DAVIES. (eds.), *Marsilio Ficino: His Theology, His Philosophy, His Legacy.* 2002. ISBN 90 04 11855 1
109. SANDY, G., *The Classical Heritage in France.* 2002. ISBN 90 04 11916 7
110. SCHUCHARD, M.K., *Restoring the Temple of Vision.* Cabalistic Freemasonry and Stuart Culture. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12489 6
111. EIJNATTEN, J. VAN. *Liberty and Concord in the United Provinces.* Religious Toleration and the Public in the Eighteenth-Century Netherlands. 2003.
ISBN 90 04 12843 3
112. BOS, A.P. *The Soul and Its Instrumental Body.* A Reinterpretation of Aristotle's Philosophy of Living Nature. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13016 0
113. LAURSEN, J.C. & J. VAN DER ZANDE (eds.). *Early French and German Defenses of Liberty of the Press.* Elie Luzac's *Essay on Freedom of Expression* (1749) and Carl Friedrich Bahrdt's *On Liberty of the Press and its Limits* (1787) *in English Translation.* 2003.
ISBN 90 04 13017 9
114. POTT, S., M. MULSOW & L. DANNEBERG (eds.). *The Berlin Refuge 1680-1780.* Learning and Science in European Context. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12561 2
115. GERSH, S. & B. ROEST (eds.). *Medieval and Renaissance Humanism.* Rhetoric, Representation and Reform. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13274 0
116. LENNON, T.M. (ed.). *Cartesian Views.* Papers presented to Richard A. Watson. 2003.
ISBN 90 04 13299 6
117. VON MARTELS, Z. & A. VANDERJAGT (eds.). *Pius II – 'El Più Expeditivo Pontefice'.* Selected Studies on Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (1405-1464). 2003.
ISBN 90 04 13190 6
118. GOSMAN, M., A. MACDONALD & A. VANDERJAGT (eds.). *Princes and Princely Culture 1450–1650.* Volume One. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13572 3
119. LEHRICH, C.I. *The Language of Demons and Angels.* Cornelius Agrippa's Occult Philosophy. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13574 X
120. BUNGE, W. VAN (ed.). *The Early Enlightenment in the Dutch Republic, 1650–1750.* Selected Papers of a Conference held at the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel 22–23 March 2001. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13587 1
121. ROMBURGH, S. VAN, *"For My Worthy Freind Mr Franciscus Junius."* An Edition of the Correspondence of Francis Junius F.F. (1591-1677). 2004. ISBN 90 04 12880 8
122. MULSOW, M. & R.H. POPKIN (eds.). *Secret Conversions to Judaism in Early Modern Europe.* 2004. ISBN 90 04 12883 2
123. GOUDRIAAN, K., J. VAN MOOLENBROEK & A. TERVOORT (eds.). *Educa-tion and Learning in the Netherlands, 1400-1600.* 2004. ISBN 90 04 13644 4
124. PETRINA, A. *Cultural Politics in Fifteenth-Century England: The Case of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester.* 2004. ISBN 90 04 13713 0
125. SCHUURMAN, P. *Ideas, Mental Faculties and Method.* The Logic of Ideas of Descartes and Locke and Its Reception in the Dutch Republic, 1630–1750. 2004.
ISBN 90 04 13716 5
126. BOCKEN, I. *Conflict and Reconciliation: Perspectives on Nicholas of Cusa.* 2004.
ISBN 90 04 13826 9
127. OTTEN, W. *From Paradise to Paradigm.* A Study of Twelfth-Century Humanism. 2004.
ISBN 90 04 14061 1
128. VISSER, A.S.Q. *Joannes Sambucus and the Learned Image.* The Use of the Emblem in Late-Renaissance Humanism. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13866 8
129. MOOIJ, J.J.A. *Time and Mind.* History of a Philosophical Problem. 2005.
ISBN 90 04 14152 9
130. BEJCZY, I.P. & R.G. NEWHAUSER (eds.). *Virtue and Ethics in the Twelfth Century.* 2005.
ISBN 90 04 14327 0
131. FISHER, S. *Pierre Gassendi's Philosophy and Science.* Atomism for Empiricists. 2005.
ISBN 90 04 11996 5
132. WILSON, S.A. *Virtue Reformed.* Rereading Jonathan Edwards's Ethics. 2005.
ISBN 90 04 14300 9
133. KIRCHER, T. *The Poet's Wisdom.* The Humanists, the Church, and the Formation of Philosophy in the Early Renaissance. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14637 7

134. MULSOW, M. & J. ROHLS (eds.). *Socinianism and Arminianism.* Antitrinitarians, Calvinists and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14715 2

135. RIETBERGEN, P. *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome.* Barberini Cultural Policies. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14893 0

136. CELENZA, C. & K. GOUWENS (eds.). *Humanism and Creativity in the Renaissance.* Essays in Honor of Ronald G. Witt. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14907 4

137. AKKERMAN, F. & P. STEENBAKKERS (eds.). *Spinoza to the Letter.* Studies in Words, Texts and Books. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14946 5

138. FINKELSTEIN, A. *The Grammar of Profit: The Price Revolution in Intellectual Context.* 2006. ISBN 90 04 14958 9

139. ITTERSUM, M.J. VAN. *Profit and Principle.* Hugo Grotius, Natural Rights Theories and the Rise of Dutch Power in the East Indies, 1595-1615. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14979 1

140. KLAVER, J.M.I. *The Apostle of the Flesh: A Critical Life of Charles Kingsley.* 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15128-4 , ISBN-10: 90-04-15128-1

141. HIRVONEN, V., T.J. HOLOPAINEN & M. TUOMINEN (eds.). *Mind and Modality.* Studies in the History of Philosophy in Honour of Simo Knuuttila. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15144-4, ISBN-10: 90-04-15144-3

142. DAVENPORT, A.A. *Descartes's Theory of Action.* 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15205-2, ISBN-10: 90-04-15205-9

143. MAZZOCCO, A. *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism.* 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15244-1, ISBN-10: 90-04-15244-X

144. VERBAAL, W., Y. MAES & J. PAPY (eds.). *Latinitas Perennis, Volume I: The Continuity of Latin Literature.* 2007. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15327-1, ISBN-10: 90-04-15327-6

145. BOULTON, D'ARCY J.D. & J.R. VEENSTRA (eds.). *The Ideology of Burgundy.* The Promotion of National Consciousness, 1364-1565. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15359-2, ISBN-10: 90-04-15359-4

146. RULER, H. VAN, A. UHLMANN & M. WILSON (eds.). *Arnold Geulincx* Ethics. With Samuel Beckett's Notes. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15467-4, ISBN-10: 90-04-15467-1